HEBREW CHRISTIANITY AND MESSIANIC JUDAISM

ON THE CHURCH-SECT CONTINUUM

HEBREW CHRISTIANITY AND MESSIANIC JUDAISM

ON THE CHURCH-SECT CONTINUUM

by

Rachael L.E. Kohn

A Dissertation
Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

McMaster University
August, 1985

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (1985)
(Religious Studies)

MCMASTER UNIVERSITY
Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: Hebrew Christianity and Messianic Judaism on the Church-Sect Continuum

AUTHOR: Rachael L.E. Kohn, B.A., M.A.

SUPERVISOR: Professor Louis Greenspan

NUMBER OF PAGES: ix, 214

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (1985)
(Religious Studies)

MCMASTER UNIVERSITY
Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: Hebrew Christianity and Messianic Judaism on the Church-Sect Continuum

AUTHOR: Rachael L.E. Kohn, B.A., M.A.

SUPERVISOR: Professor Louis Greenspan

NUMBER OF PAGES: ix, 214

SCOPE AND CONTENTS: This thesis places the Hebrew Christianity and Messianic Jewish movements on the church-sect continuum devised by Rodney Stark and William Sims Bainbridge. The social movement analysis of the Hamilton Friends of Israel, an organization caught between both movements, shows how it has managed to place itself on two different points of the church-sect continuum. The situation of the HFOI is illuminated by a reflection on the different "agendas" of the Jew and the Gentile in the Messianic movement as a whole.

ABSTRACT

This thesis places Hebrew Christianity and Messianic Judaism on the church-sect continuum devised by Rodney Stark and William Sims Bainbridge (1979, 1980). According to an axis indicating low to high tension with the environment, Hebrew Christianity is placed on the para-church node, between the denomination and the sect. Messianic Judaism, in general, is placed on the high tension, sect end of the continuum. It is recognized, however, that individual organizations which comprise the movements may vary widely in their relationships to the environment. Since the organizations as well as the movements may oscillate on the church-sect continuum, social movement propositions are introduced that can explain how and under what conditions these changes occur. A study of one Hebrew Christian organization, which contains both a low and a high tension group, shows, on the one hand, that a single organization can occupy two different points on the church-sect continuum simultaneously. It shows, on the other hand, that this is made possible through the skillful use of leadership functions, which in turn is buttressed by the symbolic value of a Jewish leader. Finally, the peculiar situation of the

HFOI is seen as reflective of the larger trends in the Hebrew Christian and Messianic Jewish movements, in general, and the different "agendas" of the Jewish and the Gentile followers, in particular.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am indebted to many people who have assisted in my education in the Hebrew Christian and Messianic Jewish movements. I wish it were possible to thank all of them here. Dr. Robert Blumstock first suggested that I study the local Hebrew Christian group, the Hamilton Friends of Israel. Dr. Blumstock gave unflagging moral and intellectual support during that process and afterward as the scope of the study enlarged.

This study would not have been possible without the gracious cooperation of the leader of the HFOI. He agreed to a long series of interviews, and generously gave his time and attention to my project. His wife, as well as the other members of the group, were always open and more than willing to assist me.

I have also benefited greatly from the conversations and interviews with the leader and several members of a Messianic congregation in Toronto. As well, I would like to thank Gloria Walker of the American Board of Missions to the Jews, who granted me an interview. Many others in the movements willingly shared their thoughts with me, and they have added immeasurably to my understanding of the subject.

Other people have contributed in important ways to the successful undertaking of this study. The Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council funded my research for the years 1980-81 and 1981-82. The SSHRC also granted a travel stipend that enabled me to accompany the HFOI to Israel. McMaster University's Yates Fund awarded me travel expenses for an indispensable field trip to Grantham, Pennsylvania, where the Messianic Jewish Alliance of America held its annual conference, June 29th to July 4th, 1982. The Yates Fund also made possible my attendance at several academic conferences, where I presented papers on my research, and received valuable and encouraging comments from other sociologists of religion.

I owe special thanks to my supervisor, Dr. Louis Greenspan, whose enthusiasm and support for this project has been particularly salutary in the "last stretch" of preparing the dissertation.

To those special friends who have made my life as a graduate student immeasurably richer, I owe a debt that cannot be expressed in words, but will ever be remembered.

Finally, I would like to thank my family who have always believed in me, and patiently awaited this culmination of my graduate studies.

To my family.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter One: Page

The Problem..... 1
Church-Sect and the Diffuse Religious Movement..... 3
Church-Sect and Social Movement Propositions..... 8
Endnotes for Chapter One..... 21

Chapter Two:

Hebrew Christianity..... 28
The Intellectual and Social Attendents to Hebrew Christianity..... 28
The Rise of Zionism..... 34
Jewish Missions..... 37
Jewish Missionaries..... 43
The Hebrew Christian Alliance of America..... 52
Summary..... 55
Endnotes for Chapter Two..... 56

Chapter Three:

Hebrew Christianity on the Church-Sect Continuum... 68
Difference..... 69
"Hebrew Christian"..... 69
Antagonism..... 80
Hebrew Christianity Versus Gentile Christianity. 81
Gentile Christianity Versus Hebrew Christianity. 86
Separation..... 92
Conclusion..... 101
Endnotes for Chapter Three..... 103

Chapter Four:

Messianic Judaism on the Church-Sect Continuum..... 105
The Wake of Hebrew Christianity..... 105
Messianic Judaism..... 108
The Elevation of Jewish Religious Life..... 110
Doctrinal Foundations of Messianic Judaism..... 115
Messianic Judaism's Relationship to the Gentiles and the Church..... 120

Hebrew Christian Reactions..... 129
Conclusion..... 136
Endnotes for Chapter Four..... 141

Chapter Five:

The Hamilton Friends of Israel: Between Two Movements..... 144
Social Movement Propositions and Religious Groups.. 146
The Dual Leadership Functions..... 147
Sources of Strain in Leadership..... 148
The Case of the Hamilton Friends of Israel..... 150
An Organization Becalmed..... 151
From Active to Passive Evangelization of the Jews.. 153
The HFOI's Mission to the Christian Community..... 155
The Weekly Praise and Prayer Fellowship..... 158
The Rise of an Exclusive Faction..... 164
The Reaction of the Churches..... 167
The Leader's Symbolic Value..... 169
Endnotes for Chapter Five..... 175

Chapter Six:

Conclusions..... 178
Endnotes for Chapter Six..... 191

Bibliography..... 192

Appendix..... 209

CHAPTER ONE

The Problem

Sociologists of religion have paid little attention to Hebrew Christianity, an outgrowth of Evangelical Protestantism, now ending its first century on this continent.[1] There are probably many reasons for its near exclusion from the vast body of research articles and books on contemporary North American religion. To be sure, the predominant reason for this is simply ignorance of it, despite the many organizations and congregations which are included under the Hebrew Christian rubric.[2]

Other reasons may be adduced, however, such as the inherent difficulties Hebrew Christianity presents to sociologists who would expect to classify it according to church-sect categories, even as they are unsure if it is a Jewish or a Christian movement. While an examination of its historical origins places the movement squarely in the nineteenth century Evangelical Protestant camp, a review of its organizations, which include associations, missions to Jews, publishing houses, and sectarian congregations does not suggest a single classification in church-sect terms. It is necessary, therefore, to distinguish between the diffuse

religious movement as a whole and the quite different organizations and congregations that comprise it.

When such a distinction is made, however, and a sectarian organization is isolated for study, a problem with the church-sect tradition itself comes to light. A melange of models, theories, rebuttals, and additions, dubbed the "cottage industry" of sociologists of religion, the `inherited tradition' of church-sect theory has rarely incorporated Jewish material (Steinberg, 1965, p. 117, n. 1).[3] While this limitation has elicited little comment, it does frustrate the effort to categorize Hebrew Christian groups, whose significant Jewish emphases conflict with some of the commonly held criteria for the "sect."[4]

Even were a satisfactory definition of sect arrived at, which would apply to Hebrew Christian congregations, another problem arises. Given the possible range of organizational configurations within the Hebrew Christian movement, particularly since the emergence in 1975 of a congregational sub-movement, Messianic Judaism,[5] what church-sect theory can explain and predict the ideological and structural changes that can occur within a given Hebrew Christian organization? Since church-sect theory has focused more on building taxonomies of static organizational types than on formulating propositions that could predict their internal changes (Demerath III, 1967, p. 83), the standard Weberian-Niebuhrian conception of a linear progression from

sect to denomination and, more recently, from cult to sect (Wallis, 1976, pp. 1-18),[6] has enjoyed a perduring, if somewhat modified, reign.[7] Organizational studies of religious groups and social movements more recently, however, have questioned whether their transformation into more bureaucratized structures was necessarily linear in progression or uniform in manifestation.[8] The evidence from a Canadian Hebrew Christian organization, which will provide the empirical case for this study, shows that it need be neither.

Church-Sect and the Diffuse Religious Movement

The sociological study of religious groups or movements invariably includes a statement denoting their organizational character. Far from incidental, the ascription of either church or sect, not to mention the many interstitial organizational types, implies something about the "legitimacy" a group or movement is accorded by its religious and secular environments.[9] Of the critics that have reviewed and revised various church-sect theories, models, and typologies,[10] few have rejected the general observation that churches and denominations enjoy a more benign, if accommodating, relationship to social institutions than do sects. Because sects, by their nature, deviate from or challenge the status quo, it has been a routine matter to

"locate" a religious group or movement in society by discovering its church-sect status.

The identification of church-sect status has usually entailed an evaluation of existing theories and a selection or reformulation of the one most compatible with the religious group in question. In addition to the ironic effect of proliferating rather than refining church-sect categories, this approach has erred in presuming the unified nature of the group under study. While the presumption may hold true for the singular religious group or possibly the highly centralized religious movement, it is dubious for the decentralized religious movement. An ascription of one of the church-sect categories, however formulated, could not, in itself, account for the diverse organizational configurations and ideological emphases within such a movement nor could it make sense of the varying receptions by different social and religious environments in which branches of the movement carry out their mission. The study of the Freigemeinde of Wisconsin by Demerath III and Thiessen (1966), for example, shows how two branches of this rationalist, anti-clerical movement developed in widely divergent directions as a consequence of the quite different socio-cultural make-up of each group's locale.[11]

Perhaps the best known example of the diffuse movement in recent years is Pentecostalism, whose segmentation and international penetration have resulted,

according to Gerlach and Hine (1970, pp. 69-70), "in the establishment of groups with all sorts of organizational forms [ranging] from the most egalitarian to the most autocratic, and include all sizes and degrees of organizational complexity...[as well as] ideological variation, methods of recruitment, modes of commitment, and type of goals and means". In light of "this organizational smorgasbord" (p. 70), one would expect to find both sectarian and denominational types of religious organizations, among others, within the Pentecostal movement with the attendant variations of "legitimacy" accorded them in their particular settings.

A lesser known religious movement but one with an equally diverse composition is Hebrew Christianity. The more than century-old Jewish offshoot of the nineteenth century Evangelical movement, Hebrew Christianity inherited the missionary zeal of the latter while it claimed a unique position in Christendom as "the Jewish wing of the body of Christ" (Fruchtenbaum, 1974, p. 48). The form that this "Jewish wing" of the church should take was variously conceived in the movement and consequently a wide range of organizations emerged. Since its not only quite different degrees of independence from established churches, but also with diverse views on the proper expression of the Jewish heritage and its centrality to the Hebrew Christian life.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the attempt to classify this diffuse movement according to a church-sect category resulted in the ambiguous designation, "reluctant sect". This was the conclusion reached by B. Z. Sobel, the author of the only critical book, in addition to several articles, on Hebrew Christianity. Sobel (1974, p. 11) accorded Hebrew Christianity the ambivalent status probably as a compromise between, on the other hand, the unique theological and eschatological claims of the movement, and on the other hand, the particular Hebrew Christian mission he observed, whose Friday evening service did not preclude its members' attendance at Sunday services at local churches.

To other students of Hebrew Christianity, however, the sectarian character of the groups they studied was in greater evidence. Glick's (1958, p. 420) account of a Hebrew Christian church in Chicago, established in 1934,[12] is in every respect a description of a sect which not only transcends its members' former denominational affiliations but also replaces them with what they believe to be a more authentically Christian distinction, their Biblical status as God's first chosen. Sharot's (1968) study of a Hebrew Christian congregation in Germany, showed unequivocally that the group functioned as a sect for several decades until the leader virtually dissolved it be decree. In the quite different setting of California, Gutwirth (1982) described yet another organizational manifestation of Hebrew

Christianity - a "Jewish church," which functioned as a unique branch of the Open Door Community Church. More than nominally different, the Jewish church under the leadership of Hebert Hillel Goldberg (Rausch, 1980, p. 107) offered Jewish style services, replete with the recitation in Hebrew and English of prayers and benedictions pivotal to the Jewish liturgy (Gutwirth, 1982, p. 40).

Yet, not even the existence of these groups and many like them that have been "planted" by the recent Hebrew Christian sub-movement, Messianic Judaism,[13] has replaced the many traditional Hebrew Christian missionary organizations, such as the American Board of Missions to the Jews[14] and the American Messianic Fellowship.[15] It should be evident that to subsume the Hebrew Christian movement under a single church-sect category or variation thereof, such as "reluctant sect" glosses over the organizational as well as the ideological diversity within the movement.

Labelling the movement as a whole not only results in an inaccurate picture of the organizations that comprise the Hebrew Christian movement, but it also obscures the impact that such diversity can have on a single Hebrew Christian organization. While the Hebrew Christian movement embraced both missions with the limited goal of evangelizing the Jews, on the one hand, and congregations with the ambitious goal of establishing a Hebrew Christian church, on the other hand, it

also included many organizations in between, some of which attempted to serve both goals through the maintenance of contrasting, even conflicting, structures.

Such an organization is the Hamilton Friends of Israel, a Hebrew Christian mission which has spawned an exclusive congregation even while retaining its original mandate to act as a mission to Jews and provide a non-denominational Thursday evening prayer group. Though the Hamilton Friends of Israel is not presented here as necessarily the most typical of Hebrew Christian organizations, it, nonetheless, illustrates the structural consequences of incorporating in a single organization the major trends that have co-existed in the Hebrew Christian movement. Similar to Isichei's (1966) line of inquiry, which both challenged the Niebuhrian assumption of a unified religious movement and identified the co-existence of sectarian and denominational outlooks in nineteenth century English Quakerism, this study reveals the contrasting trends endemic to Hebrew Christianity, their heightened saliency with the emergence of Messianic Judaism, and their expression within the narrow context of one organization, the Hamilton Friends of Israel.

Church-Sect Theory and Social Movement Propositions

It has been suggested that Hebrew Christianity does not conform to the limits of a single church-sect category,

but actually contains within it organizations which may be found at different points on the church-sect continuum. In order to show this, however, a church-sect continuum must be selected that will easily account for particular characteristics of Hebrew Christianity, without proving to be an unwieldy taxonomy of organizational types.[16]

The church-sect continuum which is perhaps the most useful one to have emerged in recent years is that inspired by Benton Johnson's (1963, 1971) seminal critiques of church-sect theory in which he proposed the classification of religious groups by a single attribute in place of numerous correlates.[17] Based upon Johnson's concluding statement that "a church is a religious group that accepts the social environment in which it exists [while] a sect is a religious group that rejects the social environment in which it exists," Stark and Bainbridge (1979, 1980) sketched a distilled version of church-sect theory. Using the more inclusive concept of "tension" between a religious group and society, they added that a group's sectarian character is as much a product of its rejection of society as society's rejection of it.

Their formulation, while not entirely new,[18] captures the central attribute around which virtually all versions of the church-sect distinction were developed since Troeltsch first elaborated it (Coleman, 1968, p. 61). Yet it wisely

avoids the ascription of static correlates (such as, low versus high class, small versus large size) and value-laden language (such as Niebuhr's "compromised" denomination), which are, on the one hand, historically specific and culture bound,[19] and, on the other hand, unable to anticipate fluctuating levels of "tension" between a religious group and its socio-cultural milieu as well as varying levels within a particular religious group.[20]

Stark and Bainbridge calibrate the church-sect continuum on an axis measuring a group's low to high tension with the socio-economic environment according to three aspects of sub-cultural deviance: "difference," "antagonism," and "separation." By referring to these three aspects of sub-cultural deviance metaphorically as "three moving parts by which tension is created and sustained," Stark and Bainbridge suggest their changing intensity (as a result of changes in either the group or its environment) while leaving the identification of their historical expression to the individual researcher.[21]

The utility of this functional perspective was demonstrated by Stephen Steinberg (1965), whose study of Reform Judaism as an emergent "church" in Germany was likewise based on a refinement of Benton Johnson's "one variable" distinction between church and sect. Steinberg's analysis of the German-American Reform Movement, which focused on the movement's effort to institutionalize a "post-

emancipation" form of Judaism that would minimize the tension between it and the dominant culture, is one of the few successful applications of church-sect theory to Judaism.[22] Its suitability for the case of Hebrew Christianity lies in its ability to transcend the overtly Christian attributes of previous church-sect formulations, such as the church's dispensation of grace and the sect's "priesthood of all believers" (Troeltsch, 1931, I, pp. 431-5), without simply adding to the existing typologies a set of new characteristics deriving from the particular case. Moreover, in its demonstrated ability to treat the Reform Movement as responsive to the dominant non-Jewish culture - which virtually broke in upon nineteenth century Judaism - the church-sect theory developed by Steinberg and its later counterpart by Stark and Bainbridge are especially suited to the Hebrew Christian movement, which arose within the ranks of nineteenth century Evangelical Christianity.

Although the conceptual similarities of the two approaches are considerable, the methodological differences are apparent. Steinberg's study of Reform Judaism depended on historical material, and, therefore, the evidence for the relative "tension" between the movement and the dominant socio-cultural milieu was based on an historical sketch of the period covered. Stark and Bainbridge (1980), in contrast, attempted to "operationalize" the term tension by

distributing questionnaires to various religious bodies and comparing their responses on a number of key value-laden issues. In a later nation-wide overview of religious sects in the United States, however, the authors (1981, p. 138) did not gather this same survey data for the 417 American-born sects they cited. Instead, they identified the sects primarily from J. Gordon Melton's massive catalogue, Encyclopedia of American Religions (1978), and the recently available data from the U.S. Census of religious bodies for 1890, 1908, 1916, and 1936. These sects, defined as "high tension, schismatic religious movements within a conventional religious tradition (Stark and Bainbridge, 1981, p. 131), that is, within Christianity, Judaism, and for the state of Utah, Mormonism, were ranked on a six-point scale of tension with the environment from the low through the moderate to the extreme points. Without survey data, the authors ranked several Protestant bodies as representative of each level of tension according to the "three interacting components:"

> 1) difference between the group and its environment in terms of beliefs, norms, and behaviour;
>
> 2) antagonism arising from both sides noticing these differences;
>
> 3) separation in terms of social relations between the group and outsiders (Stark and Bainbridge, 1981, p. 138).

While inconsistent with their initial aim to pursue comparative research based on quantifiable survey data (1980,

p. 107), their ranking of sects according to perceived congruities between groups and levels of tension employed the interpretive method based on "qualitative judgements" (1981, p. 137) similar to the type made by Steinberg. The only important difference lies in their previous (1980) empirical substantiation of the concept of tension as a reliable criterion by which to rank groups on the church-sect continuum. Proceeding from the authors' demonstration of the utility of the concept of tension as an ordering device, the present study will employ the method of argument based on qualitative judgements. The nature of the data on the Hebrew Christian movement as a whole, culled from a variety of historical and literary sources, as well as individual interviews and participant observation, cannot yield a statistical ranking but can support a comparative analysis.[23]

Although the church-sect continuum by Steinberg and later by Stark and Bainbridge is compatible with the study of Hebrew Christianity, it has its avowed limitations (Stark and Bainbridge, 1979, p. 129). As a concept, "tension with the socio-cultural environment" is insufficient to explain the internal workings and transformations of religious bodies. Stark and Bainbridge (1981) recognize, for instance, that religious groups may oscillate on the continuum, presumably because of changes in the three elements of tension, but they have not formulated the propositions which would explain how and under what conditions a group or leader would either

increase or decrease these three elements of tension with the environment.

In view of the fact that Stark and Bainbridge (1979, p. 129) recognized the necessity of incorporating in their preliminary church-sect theory propositions that would answer questions, such as "why and under what conditions do factions form in a religious group?" and "why and when do these result in a splitting off of a sect movement [or] a church movement?", it is surprising that they did not turn to the extensive social movement literature, which already contained a useful body of propositions concerning just such processes in the trajectories of social or religious movement organizations.[24]

The recommendation made by Stark and Bainbridge (1979, p. 129) that church-sect theorizing take into account the relationship between the external environment and the internal workings of religious bodies, in the tradition of Niebuhr (1929) is well served by the social movement literature, which has plotted the interdependent aspects of their relationships[25] while not confining itself to the purely socio-economic determinants of religious ideology. For example, the observation by Zald and Ash (1966, p. 331) that unrestricted ("inclusive") membership is more markedly affected than its restricted ("exclusive") counterpart by popular sentiments and competing values and norms reveals a

tendency toward low tension with the socio-cultural environment. In contrast, restricted ("exclusive") membership structures are associated with high tension since they serve to separate the group from other organizations and promote the difference between them.

If membership structures are one indication of the organization's degree of separation from the environment, then the goals undertaken formally define the organization's degree of ideological difference from the socio-cultural milieu. Apart from the specific content of the goals, the ideological difference of a religious group can be identified according to whether its goals are directed at implementing either larger social reform or individual change (Zald and Ash, 1966, pp. 331-2). In so far as a group organizes itself around the transformation of societal institutions it can expect to elicit a counter-reaction from the community against which it has set itself (Curtis and Zucher, 1974, p. 360).[26] Organizations directed at changing individual behaviour, in contrast, may be less threatening to dominant values and institutions (Zald and Ash, 1966, p. 331). Heightened tension with the environment is indicated, therefore, not only by the specific content and type of reformatory goals a group espouses but also by the opposition of significant social or religious institutions (Curtis and Zurcher, 1974, p. 360).[27]

The impact a group has on its socio-cultural milieu will depend on conditions both internal and external to the group. Internal conditions, such as membership structure and goals, have been mentioned in connection with a group's degree of separation and difference from its socio-cultural milieu. External conditions, notably "the ebb and flow of sentiments toward an organization", will indicate to what extent there is either vigorous opposition or potential support in the community (Zald and Ash, 1966, p. 330). The positive or negative attitude toward an organization, however, is not necessarily mirrored in the attitude toward the movement as a whole, since either an organization or a local community may constitute an aberration.[28] In any case, the presence of a strong constituency drawn from the dominant or powerful local class will eventually decrease tension between the organization (or broader movement) and society and, in some cases, effect its absorption into established institutions.

While the elimination of tension between an organization and its environment may occur over time, such as in the classic case of a radical sect's transformation into an accommodated denomination, this development is not necessarily typical. When both the popularity and physical growth, which usually signal this transformation, are not forthcoming and an organization survives with only limited success in reaching its goals, it is in a "becalmed" state

(Zakuta, 1964; Zald and Ash, 1966, p. 333). The latter is characterized by the redefinition and or postponed expected fulfillment of the organization's goals. This change from an optimistic to a more realistic outlook, which is usually accompanied by a shift to organizational maintenance and oligarchization (Zald and Ash, 1966, pp. 333-4; Killian, 1964, p. 442), is common among, though not restricted to, organizations with small or relatively powerless constituencies.[29] The becalmed organization or movement is also frequently associated with either millenarian sects that have continued past the originally predicted time of apocalyptic fulfillment or missionary movements that have made only slight inroads into the "unsaved" society.

If the lack of a constituency arising from a variety of factors, including exclusive membership, radical goals, and unsympathetic prevailing attitudes, contributes to the group's marginality and continued tension with the environment, then leadership styles can work to either diffuse this tension or enhance it significantly (see Beckford, 1973, pp. 34-5). Gusfield's (1966) study of leadership in the Women's Christian Temperance Union showed that these two functions are inherent in the leader's roles as an articulator to the community and as a mobilizer of his followers. According to Gusfield, the articulation leadership function links an organization and its tactics to

other organizations in society and reduces tension between them by presenting a scaled-down version of its message.[30] The mobilization leadership function, in contrast, heightens the ideological uniqueness of the organization and its tension with the environment by reaffirming the goals and values of the organization and building its members' commitment to them. While the extent to which a leader stresses one function more than the other depends on a variety of factors,[31] it is primarily a "strategic choice" whose consequences for both the group and its relationship with the environment can be anticipated and thereby "managed" (see Johnson, 1971, p. 135).

It has not been the purpose here to cover the full range of social movement propositions compatible with the church-sect theory of Stark and Bainbridge, but to outline and foreshadow some of those most salient to the discussion which follows. Other propositions drawn from the writers already mentioned as well as from students of religious and social movements, who have carried out more limited empirical or theoretical studies, will enter into the discussion where they contribute to a deeper understanding of the Hebrew Christian and Messianic Jewish movements, in general, and the Hamilton Friends of Israel, in particular.

Since the propositions already mentioned gain complexity as they are found in various historical combinations, there can be no final configuration which alone

accounts for the trajectories of all religious groups. Indeed, the perennial quest to arrive at a universal theory of "origins", a quest shared by Stark and Bainbridge (1979a), is not the particular concern of the author. It is unlikely that any one church-sect theory could account for the multifarious origins of all religious movements and organizations nor is it necessarily relevant to the study of organizational characteristics and dynamics. Neither Weber nor Troeltsch developed a church-sect theory of origins, and even Niebuhr's study of denominationalism examined the organizational development of sects and denominations already in existence (Swatos, 1981, p. 19). It is possible, however, to employ a church-sect theory to explain and to predict an organization's shifts backwards and forwards on a continuum, like beads on an abacus, indicating low to high tension with the environment. This is a view shared by William Swatos (1981), who recently took to task sociologists, among them Stark and Bainbridge, (1979a), who have attempted to incorporate a theory of origins of sects and cults with a theory of changes they undergo once formed (shifts along the church-sect continuum).

It is my intention, therefore, first to employ the church-sect theory of Stark and Bainbridge (1979, 1980) as an heuristic device to order the vast amount of data on Hebrew Christianity and Messianic Judaism, and to show the

variations in the movements' relationships to the environment, in terms of the three aspects of "tension". The overview of the two movements thus presented will provide a backdrop to the study of a Canadian Hebrew Christian organization, the Hamilton Friends of Israel. The overview of the diverse trends within Hebrew Christianity will foreshadow the emergence of Messianic Judaism, and, further, it will anticipate the seeming contradictions in the structure and ideology of the Hamilton Friends of Israel. Some of the insights provided by the social movement propositions will help explain why and how the pastor of the Hamilton Friends of Israel has assumed the role as leader of both a "low tension" and a "high tension" group simultaneously and in the same organization.

ENDNOTES FOR CHAPTER ONE

[1]For an historical introduction to Hebrew Christianity see Hugh Schonfield's The History of Jewish Christianity (Oxford: Kemp Hall Press, Ltd., 1936) and Jacob Jocz's The Jewish People and Jesus Christ (London: S.P.C.K., 1954).

[2]A table showing some of the main Hebrew Christian organizations appears in James Hutchen's article, "Messianic Judaism: A Progress Report", Missiology, An International Review, Vol. 5, No. 3 (July, 1977), p. 297. For the only critical articles on the largest and oldest Hebrew Christian organization in America, the American Board of Missions to the Jews, Inc., see Robert E. Blumstock, "Missions to Jews: Reduction of Intergroup Tension", Practical Anthropology, Vol. 14, No. 1 (January-February, 1967), pp. 37-43 and "Fundamentalism, Prejudice, and Missions to Jews", The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology", Vol. 5, No. 1 (1968), pp. 27-35.

[3]It is interesting to note that Marshall Sklare's apt designation of American Judaism as an "ethnic church" in his Conservative Judaism: An American Religious Movement (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1955) left almost no trace in subsequent church-sect discussions, which rarely have incorporated that category. Even the indefatigable church-sect typologizer, J. Milton Yinger, who excerpted Sklare's study in Religion, Society and the Individual (New York: Macmillan, 1957), pp. 458-63, classed Judaism in the United States "more nearly an established sect than a denomination" (The Scientific Study of Religion, New York: The Macmillan Co., 1970, p. 269) with no consideration given to the ethnic church category.

[4]Thomas F. O'Dea in his article on "Sects and Cults" in the International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, Vols. 13-14 (1968), p. 135, on the contrary, pointed to the cross-cultural applicability of the typology but referred to Far and Near Eastern traditions, excluding Judaism. More recent work by sociologists has shown the general application of church-sect categories, as they are commonly formulated, to be spurious. See Michael Hill, A Sociology of Religion (New York: Basic Books, 1973), p. 47 and Bryan Wilson, Religion in Sociological Perspective (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), pp. 89-90, 100-05.

[5]David A. Rausch, "The Messianic Congregational Movement", The Christian Century (September 15-22, 1982), pp. 926-9. For responses from spokesmen of two leading organizations in the movement see "Letters" (`More on Messianic') in The Christian Century (October 30, 1982).

[6]Wallis's view that the originator of the Church of Scientology, L. Ron Hubbard, orchestrated the organization's transformation from a cult to a sect, in order to gain control over the members, is consistent with J. Milton Yinger's observation in Religion in the Struggle for Power (Durham: Duke University Press, 1946), p. 22, that a cult is simply a more unstable version of a sect, which either "disintegrates when the members die, or [is] molded into an institution with techniques for admitting new members and preserving their common interests..." Indeed both sect and cult "gradually take on some of the characteristics of the church". But see the reformulation by Stark and Bainbridge (1979a, p. 126) in which they state unequivocally that "a theory of sect formation simply will not serve as a theory of cult formation. The genesis of the two are very different".

[7]In the typological tradition, Yinger (1946, p. 22-3) introduced the category of "established sect", which, despite its "traits of a church of the `lowest power'", nevertheless, is "still seen as a group apart" which has resisted the denominationalizing tendency. He further explained its persistence on the basis of ideological factors in Religion, Society and the Individual, pp. 151-55. Bryan Wilson's sub-typology of Christian sects, which appeared in "An Analysis of Sect Development", American Sociological Review, Vol. 24 (February, 1959), pp. 3-15, is congruent with Yinger's discussion. David A. Martin's "The Denomination", British Journal of Sociology, Vol. 13 (March, 1962), pp. 1-14, ruptured the link between the sect and the denomination by pointing out that many denominations arose sui generis (via the eccesiola in ecclesia).

[8]Apart from the explicitly typological efforts, Benton Johnson's remark in "Church and Sect Revisited", Journal For the Scientific Study of Religion, Vol. 10, No. 2 (Summer, 1971), p. 131, that "churchly or accommodated status is not irreversible" found historical support in Elizabeth Allo Isichei's seldom mentioned study "From Sect to Denomination in English Quakerism, With Special Reference to the Nineteenth Century", British Journal of Sociology, Vol. 15, No. 3 (1964), pp. 207-22, in which the move toward a denominational posture was shown to have been interrupted periodically by factions in the movement that preferred to conserve its sectarian tradition.

[9]The legitimacy a group is accorded by its environment is determined to some extent by the religious structure of society. William H. Swatos, Jr., in "Monopolism, Pluralism, Acceptance, and Rejection: An Integrated Model for Church-Sect Theory", Review of Religious Research, Vol. 16, No. 3 (Spring, 1975), pp. 174-85, formulated a model for church-sect theory, which included the monopolistic and the pluralistic types of society as partially determining the classification, if not the trajectory, of religious groups. Wilson (1959, pp. 8-9) had made essentially the same argument, invoking external social circumstances to explain the proliferation of denominations in the United States from the 1800's to the present.

[10]Though there is some disagreement whether the church-sect typology should be referred to as a "theory", the substituted term, "dimension", suggested by Erich Goode in "Some Critical Observations on the Church-Sect Dimension", Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, Vol. 6, No. 1 (Spring, 1967), pp. 69-77, is less troublesome only because it is more vague. In agreement with Swatos (1975, p. 174), I refer to the large body of literature as endeavours in church-sect theory, since most formulations include some theorizing, whether explicit or implicit.

[11]In his study of Conservative Judaism, Marshall Sklare (1955, p. 203) showed how the move from the ghettos in American cities to "third settlement areas" with a predominantly Christian culture forged major changes in Jewish ritual, educational, and associational patterns.

[12]David Max Eichhorn's invaluable historical record of organized missionary efforts directed at the Jews in the United States and Canada, Evangelizing the American Jew (Middle Village, N.Y.: Jonathan David Publishers, Inc., 1978), p. 187, noted that the First Hebrew Christian Presbyterian Church of Chicago, organized in 1934, was

> The first genuine Hebrew Christian Church in the United States, one which is still functioning (although it is now nondenominational)..."

[13]Christianity Today, November 21, 1981, p. 62, estimated the number of Messianic synagogues to be 40. Norman Nelson in "The Biblical Basis for Messianic Judaism", (Tape, Annual Conference of the Messianic Jewish Alliance of America, July, 1982) put the number between 40 and 50. Two books have been instrumental in this growth trend: "Phillip E. Goble's Everything You Need to Grow a Messianic Synagogue

(Pasadena: William Carey Library, 1974) and Everything You Need to Grow a Messianic Yeshiva (Pasadena: William Carey Library, 1981).

[14]The American Board of Missions to the Jews has been unwilling to relinquish its conventional form of missionary outreach, which has made it the largest Hebrew Christian publisher and financially most successful organization of its kind (see Blumstock, 1968, p. 27).

[15]The American Messianic Fellowship is independent of the Messianic Jewish Alliance of America, and, in fact, published a scathing attack on the latter in its October 1975 issue of the American Messianic Fellowship Monthly. See Chapter Four, below.

[16]Perhaps the best known taxonomy of organizational types is Bryan Wilson's (1959) classification of sects, which he later elaborated in Magic and the Millenium (Frogmore, St. Albans, Herts: Paladin, 1975) into a classification of possible "responses to the world" of deviant religious movements. Note the similarity to Yinger's (1957, pp. 152-53) sub-typology. Typologizing has come under attack, however, for its lack of logical framework, on the one hand (Johnson, 1971, p. 128), and its omissions, on the other hand (Calvin Redekop, "A New Look at Sect Development", Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, Vol. 13 (September, 1974), p. 345. Allan W. Eister, in "Toward a Radical Critique of Church-Sect Typologizing" Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, Vol. 6, No. 1 (Spring, 1967), pp. 85-90, aimed some of the harshest criticism at the typologizing enterprise partly on the basis of "the frequent confusion of sect-church `hypothesizing' with church-sect `typologizing'" (p. 85).

[17]John Scanzoni employed Johnson's reformulation of the church-sect typology first stated in "On Church and Sect", American Sociological Review, Vol. 28 (August, 1963), pp. 539-49 and later restated in "Church and Sect Revisited" (1971). Scanzoni empirically confirmed the "churchness" or "sectness" of individual respondents of American Protestant groups on the basis of their acceptance or rejection of the dominant socio-cultural values. In this, he anticipates the church-sect theory employed by Stark and Bainbridge (1979, 1981). See John Scanzoni, "A Note on Method for the Church-Sect Typology", Sociological Analysis, Vol. 26 (1965), pp. 189-209 and "Innovation and Constancy in the Church-Sect Typolgy", American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 71 (1965), pp. 320-27.

[18]Many of the ideas contained in the two articles (1979 and 1980) by Stark and Bainbridge appeared in Charles Y. Glock and Rodney Stark, Religion and Society in Tension (Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1965), pp. 242-59. The difference lies primarily in a move away from a five-fold scheme of types of deprivation and their organizational correlates to a perspective that essentially relinquishes the substantive definitions of "sect", which have resulted in a seemingly endless variety of "mixed types" (1980, pp. 105-06).

[19]For discussions on these limitations, see: Peter L. Berger, "The Sociological Study of Sectarianism", Social Research, Vol. 21 (Winter, 1954), pp. 469-73: Bryan Wilson, Religion in Sociological Perspective (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), pp. 96-105.

[20]The discrepancy between outlook of the laity and the leadership of large Protestant denominations was the subject of Jeffrey K. Hadden's The Gathering Storm in the Churches (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1969) and Paul M. Harrison's Authority and Freedom in the Free Church Tradition (Princeton University Press, 1959).

[21]The authors explain:

> We cannot specify a priori precisely which norms will be subjects of disagreement between high-tension groups and the rest of society, because sects will reflect the culture and history of the particular societies in which they emerge (1980, p. 109).

[22]See also Marshall Sklare, "Church and Laity Among Jews", in The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, Vol. 332 (November, 1960), pp. 60-70.

[23]K. Peter Takayama and Susanne B. Darnell, in "The Aggressive Organizations and the Reluctant Environment: The Vulnerability of an Inter-Faith Coordinating Agency", Review of Religious Research, Vol. 20, No. 3 (Summer, 1979), pp. 315-34, offer one of the few organizational studies of local religious groups, and they base their analysis on a wide range of data garnered from interviews, archival material, and participant observation (p. 317).

[24]For an inventory of recent organizational studies of religious and para-religious groups, see James A. Beckford, International Social Science Journal, Vol. 29, No.

2, pp. 238-45. Much of this work has been inspired by the study of the Young Men's Christian Association by M. Zald and P. Denton, "From Evangelism to General Service: On the Transformation of the Y.M.C.A.", Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 8 (June, 1963), pp. 214-34. Many of the insights drawn from that study were formulated into propositions, which were applicable to a wide range of social and religious organizations in M. Zald and R. Ash, "Social Movement Organizations: Growth, Decay and Change", Social Forces, Vol. 44 (March, 1966), pp. 327-41.

[25]The terms "social networks" and "organizational fields" have come into play to describe the patterns of linkages among members of groups as well as the coordinated system of organizations in a community. See, respectively, J. C. Mitchell, Social Networks in Urban Situations, (Manchester University Press, 1969) and R. L. Curtis and L. A. Zurcher, "Stable Resources of Protest Movements: The Multi-organizational Field", Social Forces, Vol. 52 (September, 1973), pp. 53-61. A summary analysis of the role of the environment in current organizational analysis of religious groups is found in James A. Beckford, "Religious Organizations" (A Trend Report and Bibliography), Current Sociology, Vol. 21, No. 2 (1973), pp. 34-50.

[26]Calvin Redekop, in "A New Look at Sect Development" Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, Vol. 13 (September, 1974), p. 346, concurs, in that

> the degree to which a sect's protest strikes at the central and sacred values of a society will have a strong bearing on its future prospects.

[27]Lewis M. Killian in "Social Movements", Handbook of Modern Sociology, R. E. L. Faris, ed. (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1964), p. 434, differentiates between the degrees of comprehensiveness of a social or religious movement's values, with the implication being that the more comprehensive the values, the more changes are advocated in many aspects of society, and consequently the greater the opposition that is provoked.

[28]In addition, the group's environment is never completely stable, a condition requiring an array of strategies that can cope with uncertainties. Some of these are outlined in J. D. Thompson, Organizations in Action (New York: McGraw Hill, 1967). Takayama and Darnell (1979, p. 327) showed how the Metropolitan Inter-Faith Association managed to turn around its flagging fortunes through the aggressive "product oriented" policies of its leaders.

[29]The size of the constituency may not be the only determining factor. Leo Zakuta's penetrating study of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, in A Protest Movement Becalmed: A Study of Change in the CCF (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964), p. 145, noted that during the "becalmed" period of the CCF's career the membership was larger than in its earlier, more enthusiastic ("sectarian") period,

> But a larger proportion of it [was] less involved, maintaining little more than a formal connection and refusing to be stirred into active participation no matter what efforts the party [made].

[30]This description echoes R. Heberle's in Social Movements (New York: Appleton, Century, Crafts, Inc., 1951), p. 25, which was cited in Killian (1964) p. 435:

> The publicly proclaimed goals and ideas are not always the true and real aims. Sometimes the goals are intentionally formulated in a very vague way, so as to unite masses of members who would not be able to agree on a more formal definition.

[31]It almost goes without saying that a leader's personality may be so extreme or his personal status so suspect that quite apart from his conscious exercise of the articulating leadership function, the tension between him and the surrounding community continues unabated. It appears, however, more often the case that leaders of the most notorious anti-establishment cults, among whom figure Charles Manson of the Charles Manson Cult, Jim Jones of the People's Temple, Charles Diedrich of Synanon, `Moses' David Berg of the Children of God, and L. Ron Hubbard of the Church of Scientology, place considerably more emphasis on the mobilizing than on the articulating functions, continually demanding total loyalty from their followers and actively preventing accommodations to the surrounding social and religious order. (See Roy Wallis, "Sex, Violence, and Religion", Update, A Quarterly Journal on New Religious Movements, Vol. 7, No. 4, December, 1983, pp. 8-11). It is likely that the mobilizing function better serves the needs of the autocratic personality. Indeed, Gusfield's study (1966, p. 145) suggests that the favouring of one leadership style over the other reflects, to some extent, the leader's personality.

CHAPTER TWO

Hebrew Christianity

The Hebrew Christian movement began roughly in the mid-nineteenth century on a wave of Evangelical Protestantism that witnessed numerous missionary efforts directed specifically at the Jews.[1] As the name suggests, Hebrew Christianity was a movement of Jewish converts to Christianity, largely in Great Britain and North America, who were anxious to both bring the gospel to their Jewish brethren and officially unite as "the Jewish wing of the Body of Christ" (Fruchtenbaum, 1974, p. 48). The evangelical aim of the movement was buttressed by the opportunity afforded by massive emigrations of Jews to British and North American shores,[2] and was propelled by the fundamentalist ferment running through nineteenth century Protestantism (Jocz, 1954, p. 220). The latter already had bestowed upon the Jewish nation a preeminent and exclusive place in the eschatological vision and reaffirmed Israel's role as unique among the nations.[3]

The Intellectual and Social Antecedents to Hebrew Christianity

While the extent to which Hebrew Christians should form a separate body within Christianity was never fully

agreed upon by them or their sympathizers,[4] that they were defacto members of a unique race among the nations, who occupied a special eschatological role, was widely recognized in their ranks and in Evangelical Christianity, generally. The erudite Hebrew Christian historian, Jakob Jocz, observed:

> Instead of maintaining, as the old church did that the Jewish people is utterly rejected by God [Evangelical Christianity] recognized that Israel had still a great future (Jocz, 1954, p. 221).

During the eighteenth century, a growing theological interest in prophecy, both in the pietistic movement in Germany and in the Evangelical revival in England, fixed attention on the fate of the Jewish people (Jocz, 1954, p. 221). Several tracts which detailed their prophetic role were published, among them Paul Lewis' "A Treatise on the Future Restoration of the Jews and Israelites to Their own Land...Address'd to the Jew" (London, 1747); Joseph Eyre's "Observations on the Prophecies Relating to the Restoration of the Jews" (1777); and Charles Jerram's "An Essay Tending to Show the Grounds of Scripture for the Future Restoration of Israel" (1796). By the mid-nineteenth century, when the Reverend Stamp delivered his lecture on "The Benefits Which Will Accrue to the Church of Christ from the Conversion of the Jews" (London, 1843), the belief in the "great future" of the Jewish people was entrenched in Evangelical Christianity.[5]

> God has revealed it, as connected with his own gracious purposes in reference to them, that they shall not merely be preserved a distinct and separate people, but that they shall be restored to the land of their fathers - that they shall embrace the faith of their crucified Redeemer - and that they shall be signally blessed and honored both with regard to their spiritual and temporal conditions... (Stamp, 1843, p. 8).[6]

Partly to combat the church's absorption of liberal and scientific ideas, which regarded Biblical prophecy as allegorical literature, the incipient Fundamentalist-Evangelical movement held a series of International Prophetic Conferences, beginning in 1878. These conferences were intended to clarify and broadcast the literal interpretation of scripture, at the centre of which loomed God's covenant with Israel, which the Fundamentalist Evangelicals interpreted as the everlasting Abrahamic covenant with the Jewish people. Accordingly, the subject of the Jewish people as a living testimony to the verity of the Bible figured prominently at the prophetic conferences (Rausch, 1979, p. 79ff). Professor E. F. Stroeter of Wesleyan University, addressed the 1886 conference on the first day, admonishing those who

> are very ready to simply spiritualize away all that is prophesied to the political Israel and to the geographical Palestine of restitution and rehabilitation...and to appropriate quietly to the Gentile church all there is predicted of

> BLESSING TO ISRAEL (Rausch, 1979, p. 89).

By the late nineteenth century, numerous articles and tracts had appeared, which outlined God's purposes in preserving the Jews as "a distinct and separate people".[7] This belief, which was to become the theological lodestar of Hebrew Christianity, had more than a scriptural impetus. The increasing visibility of Jews in society, their intellectual and financial achievements, and the dramatic displays of anti-semitism throughout Europe, all of which were awesomely detailed by Christian observers,[8] played no small part in popularizing the notion that the Jews were unique among the nations. The following excerpt from "The Jew in the Nineteenth Century", an article by J. T. Gracey (1890, p. 182), is typical of the hyperbolic outpouring which characterized this literature:

> But the change in the position of the Jew within the last half century is one of the most remarkable character. Fifty years ago the Jew was inert and imbecile. Now he exercises power greater than in the days of David or Solomon. The Jews today influence more people, control more bullion, and exercise more legislative power than they did when they had their temple, their land and their sceptre. They have been stationary for eighteen centuries and hunted into obscurity. Today they attract wider attention than ever before in their history.

Yet, the social and political factors of Jewish "separateness" were not perceived as determinative but as

subordinate to the prophetic unfolding of history in which God's plan for Israel was revealed. Thus, Jewish suffering and success, which both received much public attention in the nineteenth century, were not explicable without reference to God's judgement and future redemption of Israel. Indeed, Gracey (1890, p. 187) ended his article with a litany of trials and tribulations, which the Jews alone faced and miraculously survived, and concluded that "they remain to accomplish so high and holy a mission as witnesses to Jesus Christ..." In this he echoed many of his contemporaries, such as David Baron (1897, p. 890), Franz Delitzsch (1890, p. 579), and Thomas Chalmers (1902, p. 275), as well as Reverend Stamp, whose popular tract (reprinted in America in 1846), explained the significance of Jewish suffering:

> ...the Jews have groaned upwards of seventeen centuries under misery and captivity, without any certain hopes of relief, and this is an event without precedent...For, notwithstanding the joint persecutions of Christians and idolators, who equally designed their ruin, they are still in existence...Such wonders as these have surely not been wrought in vain...And further from these facts, and from the words of our Lord, we may reasonably conclude that with respect to this people there is in the future something of a more propitious nature than anything that has hitherto happened, still awaiting them (Stamp, 1843, p. 5).

The unrelieved persecution of the Jews was easily accounted as the divine retribution that followed their

rejection of the Christian messiah.

> ...[H]ad he only punished the heads of the nation who cried out `crucify him! - crucify him!', in short, had his punishments gone no further than those immediately guilty, we should have no reason to wonder at it. But they have been extended from one generation to another for many ages (Stamp, 1843, p. 6).
>
> ...In the righteous judgement of a jealous God, they have been made a proverb and a by-word, until their very name has become a reproach. They have been spoiled, oppressed, and massacred...(Stamp, 1843, p. 6).

The dramatic change in the fortunes of the Jews in the late nineteenth century, which witnessed their numerous inroads into high society, would necessitate less emphasis on this damning aspect of Christian theology. Instead, Evangelical Christians writing on modern Jews and Judaism placed increasing emphasis on the propitious signs within Jewry, especially their dispersion and their regathering in Palestine, that both affirmed God's everlasting covenant with his people and foreshadowed the imminence of Israel's restoration.[9] The more respectful, if not reverent, tone which made its way into Christian descriptions of the Jewish people during this period is exemplified by A. E. Thompson's A Century of Jewish Missions, published 1902. Thompson (1902, p. 18), explained the recent achievements of this "ambitious and capable" people, although not without first dismissing mere "human genius":

> When we deal with this race, we are at once brought face to face with the supernatural, for if behind the march of human events there be no preternatural power then their very preservation is an inexplicable mystery. The sacred historians who not only postulate God, but also assert that he is in a very special sense the God of Israel, give the only rational explanation of the survival of this insignificant nation through the wreck of successive empires, and its rejuvenescence in our own day (Thompson, 1902, p. 18).

That God was in "a very special sense, the God of Israel" was believed to have been sealed in the covenant with Abraham, which was "unconditional", "perpetual", and "perfect" (Thompson, 1902, p. 19) and destined to be fulfilled:

> With the nation regathered and reunited on the hills of Israel, and Messiah seated on the throne of his father, David, the world shall see the fulfillment of the covenant (Thompson, 1902, p. 27).[10]

The Rise of Zionism

The eschatological restoration of Israel was to find proof of imminence in the national movement which "spread like a prairie fire" throughout late nineteenth and early twentieth century Jewry. Zionism was readily embrace by many Evangelical Christians as "the beginning of the fulfillment of the prophecy that the race will be regathered to their ancient fatherland" (Thompson, 1902, p. 52; Jocz, 1954, p.

227).[11] The aforementioned International Prophetic Conferences were particularly supportive of the national restoration of the Jewish people to their homeland. Indeed, without the widespread belief in the restoration of Israel, it is hard to imagine the memorandum submitted by William E. Blackstone to President Harrison on March 5, 1891 in defence of the Zionist cause.[12] "Signed by over 500 clergymen, Federal, State and city government officials, newspaper editors, prominent industrialists and businessmen",[13] the memorandum asserted the Jewish nation's "claim to Palestine as [its] ancient homeland" since "according to God's distribution of nations it is their home - an inalienable possession from which they were expelled by force" (Kac, 1958, p. 51).

More compelling is the personal statement which William E. Blackstone appended to the memorandum. Having noted that the restoration of Jews to Palestine "seems to appeal to all classes of Christians as a magnificient humanitarian movement", he added:

> That there seem to be many evidences to show that we have reached the period in the great roll of the centuries, when the everliving God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, is lifting up His hand to the Gentiles (Isaiah 49:22), to bring His sons and daughters from far, that He may plant them again in their own land, Ezekiel 34, etc." (Kac, 1958, p. 52).

In an article published but a few months later, Blackstone further promoted the Jewish claim to Palestine:

> No other people can boast of such high authority for the title to their earthly inheritance. It is rooted in the Holy Word, which all Christian nations receive as the foundation of their religion and the rule of their practice (Kac, 1958, p. 52).[14]

Indeed, President Wilson himself is reported to have said to Rabbi Stephen S. Wise:

> I am the son of the manse, son of the Presbyterian clergyman, and therefore I am with you completely and am proud to think that I may in some degree help you to rebuild Palestine (Kac, 1958, p. 53).[15]

That this sentiment was shared by Christian statesmen on the other side of the Atlantic was affirmed by Chaim Weizman, leader of the Zionist movement and first president of the World Zionist Congress as well as the State of Israel, who wrote in his memoirs:

> Those British statesmen of the old school, I have said, were genuinely religious. They understood as a reality the concept of the Return [of the Jews to Zion]. It appealed to their tradition and their faith (Weizmann, 1949, p. 157; Kac, 1958, pp. 50-1).

In summary, the confluence of factors within Evangelical Christianity and in recent Jewish history popularized, if not confirmed, the belief in the uniqueness of Israel as God's "first chosen" and foreshadowed the eschatological drama in which the Jewish nation would play a

central role. While the details of the eschatological drama would remain a matter of theological disputation (Goodnow, 1892, p. 443), such as whether the entire Jewish nation or only a remnant would be restored to Israel, "the conversion of the Jews [was] an indispensable prerequisite to the Christian millenium" (Eichhorn, 1978, p. 2).[16]

Jewish Missions

The exalted position of the Jew in the Evangelical prophetic outlook, which called attention to "his illustrious pedigree and the still more illustrious future of his nation" (Mathieson, 1894, p. 907), would not be without its counterpart in the missionary effort. Certainly, a part of the mystique that attached to the conversion of the Jews was bound up in the unique expectations placed on them. Another, perhaps more enigmatic, aspect of Jewish conversion stemmed from the sheer difficulty of effecting it - a fact all the more evident after the great influx of Jewish immigrants to Great Britain and North America in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.[17] Indeed, if the evangelization of the heretofore inaccessible Jewish community was to herald the fulfillment of Biblical prophecy, it also would counteract this large foreign element, whose secularism as much as traditionalism was believed to be undermining the very fabric of Christian society.[18] Thus, the conversion of

Jews became a specialized, even urgent, missionary enterprise,[19] "which came to be identified almost exclusively with evangelical (Protestant) Christianity" (Sobel, 1974, p. 138).

Yet, neither the enormity nor the exclusivity of the mission field yielded many fruits. The conversion of Jews was an undertaking fraught with difficulties and, in America, apparent failure.[20] There is no doubt that a discouraging ideological and social climate hampered conversion efforts. The democratic ethos frowned upon such invasions of freedom,[21] Deist thought found conversion unnecessary,[22] and the enterprising, secularizing trend in North America, in general, attracted primarily non-religious Jewish emigres.[23] Moreover, the Reform Judaism movement offered an irresistable combination of church-like respectability to Jews, who wished to remain a religious community but at the same time embrace rationalism and a modern life style.[24] If these conditions did not offer their own protection from the inroads of the alien faith, the Jewish community did not passively tolerate all of the missionaries, and many of the more notorious ones were subjected to frontal attacks, especially in the press, which did not go unheeded by the churches.[25]

Added to the inhospitable environment, a condition that was not unique to the proselytization of Jews, was the widely held belief among clergymen that Jewish mission work itself presented problems "so entirely sui generis that the

work of a labourer in Israel [was] radically different from that among the Gentiles" (Schodde, 1891, p. 916). Indeed, therein lay "the justification of making Jewish missions a distinct branch and separate department of Gospel work among non-Christians" (Schodde, 1891, p. 916).

This attitude stemmed, in part, from the Evangelical Christians' reverence of scripture - "the religious heritage of Israel" - and their recognition of both the special relationship of the Jews to it and the privileged role they occupied in it. Consequently, the Christian could hardly claim to bring as much of the Jew as he could to the heathen.[26] Thus did one American missionary, George H. Schodde, observe that while the heathen was likely to feel inferior to the Christian bearing the gospel, the Jew

> regard[s] himself as a superior because he is the representative and exponent of the pure monotheism of the prophets [and] as such historically entitled to preeminence above the Christian who has changed and distorted the teachings by adding a polytheistic faith, and by recognizing the claims of Jesus of Nazareth as the promised Messiah. Instead of being himself a proper subject for instruction and conversion, he considers the Christian as such a subject (Schodde, 1891, p. 916).

Whether or not this represented the attitude of the Jews, it did reflect the view of the Evangelical Christians, who generally held that Jews could not be approached in the same manner as other non-Christians. Indeed, missionaries

were keenly aware of the intellectual demands placed on them in their attempts to convert the Jews, and accordingly stressed the preparation necessary for the undertaking. Hence David Baron's caution that

> a training that may qualify a man to go out and proclaim the Gospel to the civilized heathen world is utterly insufficient for a worker among the Jews (Baron, 1897, p. 895)

and Schodde's insistence that "a thorough acquaintance with the Mishna, the Talmuds, and the Midrashim" was a missionary prerequisite since "argument and proof have a place in Jewish mission work which they occupy nowhere else" (1891, p. 917).

These scholarly requirements already had begun to shape the Jewish missiological curriculum. As early as 1728, Professor Johann Heinrich Callenberg, in connection with the University of Halle, founded the first Institutum Judaicum, where Hebrew, Rabbinics, and Yiddish were taught to would-be ministers (Thompson, 1902, p. 92). Schodde, (1891, p. 917; 1898, p. 919) noted the revival in his time of more than 10 such Instituta Judaica in Germany and Switzerland. The preeminent of these was the Central Society of Leipzig, otherwise known as the Institute Judaicum Delitzschianum, named after Franz Delitzsch, its founder and head for more than a generation. Rabbi I. Lichtenstein (1908, p. 9) of Tapio Szele and later of Budapest spoke of "worthy scholars of the great Professor Franz Delitzsch, who sought to satisfy

their thirst for knowledge from the sea of the Talmud". In Britain, a similar Missionary Training College was founded in 1847 by the British Society for Propagating the Gospel Among the Jews, while a Missionary college was also erected by the London Society for Promoting Christianity Among the Jews, on their property in Bethnal Green (which they owned from 1815 to 1895) called "Palestine Place" (Thompson, 1902, p. 104). In America, the Moody Bible Institute, one of the most influential organizations in this field, has conducted a special training course in Jewish missions since 1923.

Valuable as their training programs were, these seminaries were not to last and by 1898 all but the last mentioned were defunct. In Europe, only Professor Strack at the University in Berlin maintained an Institutum Judaicum for the study of Jewish literature and Jewish missions, and Professor Buhl, the successor to the late Dr. Delitzsch, continued to publish what was considered "the leading scientific journal in the whole domain of [Jewish mission] literature" (Schodde, 1898, p. 919). While no reason for the closures were cited, it is apparent from the missionary literature of the period that despite the growing sophistication of organized efforts to the Jews, there was insufficient interest and support for the work. Thomas M. Chalmers, Superintendent of the Messiah Mission to the Jews, Chicago, declared:

> One after another of the great denominations has given up Gospel work among the Jews. They seem unable to conduct such missions with success. But it may be the failure lies with the Church rather than the field. The work of Jewish evangelism is one of peculiar difficulty and requires the fulfillment of special conditions for success. Have the Churches met these conditions? (Chalmers, 1902, p. 272).[27]

The meeting of these "special conditions" required, at the minimum, a fluency in Hebrew and the vernacular language spoken by the Jewish community (Baron, 1897, p. 895). It is not any wonder, therefore, that most missionaries were hard pressed to meet even the most basic condition necessary to convert Jews, that of interest.[28] Thus, missionary efforts directed to the Jews were vigorous but few, supported by Christians but rarely undertaken by them. Writing on the "Evangelization of Israel" (1891), the American missionary, Schodde, reflected on the situation:

> It is to be regretted that there is no general interest among Christians in Gospel work among Israelites according to the flesh. It is always a limited few, whose love for the people of God ethuse them for this difficult work. However much the Jews may have proved themselves unworthy and unthankful objects of Christian mission activity, this does not excuse us in our negligence (Schodde, 1891, p. 918).

It is David Baron's (1897, p. 893) observation, perhaps more than any other, which points to the gulf that lay between the Evangelicals and the Jews, notwithstanding

the elevation of the latter in the prophetic outlook. A leading English missionary to the Jews and founder of the Hebrew Christian testimony to Israel (1893), Baron (1897, p. 893) cautioned that "the church dare not lose sight of the Jews".

> But generally I find that in speaking to Christians about the Jew, it is very easy to carry them with you if you speak of the Jews of the past - the Jew of Bible history - or the prophetic Jew of the future; but when it comes to the actual Jew of the present day, and you want them to enter into the thoughts and mind of God in reference to Israel of the present, that is a most difficult task.

Jewish Missionaries

Baron once explained his mission by asserting that "our testimony is that of Jews to Jews" (Schonfield, 1936, p. 214). This view virtually became the motto of Jewish missions, as Jewish converts joined their ranks as missionaries. Thompson's (1902, pp. 86-117) history of Jewish missions reads like an inventory of Jewish converts. They would play an increasingly important role in Jewish missions, as the statistical table of Presbyterian Missions to Jews, compiled by Reverend S. B. Rohold in 1913 indicated. There were 15 Hebrew Christians among the 27 missionaries to Jews in Canada, 51 Hebrew Christians of 147 in the United States, and 166 Hebrew Christians of 664 in Great Britain

(1913, Appendix, n.p.).

Initially, Jewish missionaries were employed as a more effective means of bringing their brethren into the fold, and were supported largely by the contributions of established churches. While some questions were raised about both the trustworthiness of "Jewish missionaries", particularly after several were implicated in public scandals and corruption,[29] and the wisdom of segregating Jewish mission work from the universal Christian appeal, the value of these "specially qualified" workers to the church was emphasized repeatedly.[30] Their linguistic and social ties to the Jewish population gave them entry into the remote corners of the mission field, in particular, Eastern Europe. What was said about "Brother Rosenzweig", who worked for the Hope of Israel Mission in Warsaw, applied to many like him:

> He endeavours to be a Jew to the Jews and a Christian to the Christians, and without question gains access to many orthodox houses, unopen to an ordinary missionary.[31]

Jewish missionaries were also useful for the preparation of Hebrew and Yiddish translations of the New Testament and missionary tracts, which were dispensed in huge numbers.[32] Finally, however much these Jewish employees of the church were scorned by other Jews, their involvement gave this specialized field a certain legitimacy in the eyes of the Christians who supported the work.

Valuable as Jewish missionaries were to the church in general, the fact that few denominations other than the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland and Ireland and the Lutheran Church of Germany were interested in taking up this work, resulted in the unusual preponderance of independent and non-denominational Jewish missions (Thompson, 1902, p. 84). These missions received contributions from churches, but remained outside the control of sectarian boards. Even the London Jews Society, wrote an historian of Jewish missions,

> the oldest and largest of them all, is purely Episcopalian; yet it is in affiliation with rather than an essential part of the Church work. In England and on the Continent there are a number of sectarian missions, while almost all of the numerous societies in America are of this class (Thompson, 1902, p. 84).[33]

While Jewish missions initially were erected to meet the particular requirements of evangelizing the Jew, problem turned to privilege when they also provided special prayer services, spawned congregations, published journals, and joined associations all catering to the unique "spiritual needs" of Hebrew Christians, as converted Jews were known. Thus, did the relative freedom of non-sectarian missions (as well as those granted considerable freedom by their parent churches) contribute immeasurably to the formation of a Hebrew Christian movement.

Among the prayer services and congregations which were established to minister to Hebrew Christian needs, the following were frequently noted in the annals of missionary literature. An independent Jewish Christian synagogue, which had "something of synagogue ritual in it, but a very full Gospel in the preaching", was founded by Joseph Rabinowitz in 1882 in Kishnev, Russia (Curtiss, 1898, p. 925).[34] After his death in 1899, the Hebrew Christian Alliance of Besarabia perpetuated his efforts and, noted an historian of Hebrew Christianity, enjoyed "steadily increasing numbers" (Schonfield, 1936, p. 226).

The efforts of I. Lichtenstein, rabbi of Tapio Szele, Hungary, to found a similar synagogue in Budapest in the late 1800's were not as successful.[35] Both he and Rabinowitz received aid from the Jewish Christian Testimony Mission, London,[36] although Lichtenstein refused to be baptized (Schodde, 1898, p. 918; Gaebelein, 1897, p. 901; Gracey, 1890, p. 187). Another Hebrew Christian pioneer was Theophil Lucky, the editor of Eduth le Israel. According to Jocz (1954, p. 256), who had met some of Lucky's former followers after their leader's death,

> Lucky managed to collect a circle of Jesus-believing hasidim both in Stanislow and Lwow, and the movement which he started in some ways resembled the one of Kishineff [sic] led by Rabinowtsch [sic].

A Jewish Christian synagogue of Smyrna, established 1894, was reported to have a total of 185 people after half the congregation withdrew (Schodde, 1896, p. 278). One questionnaire to missionaries, prepared for the 1927 Budapest and Warsaw conferences on "the Christian approach to the Jew", reported that "efforts to found Hebrew Christian congregations have been going on in Germany...," and in Poland converts were "sometimes formed into Hebrew Christian congregations" (IMC, 1927, p. 109). Other reports of Hebrew Christian activities in Europe include Schodde's (1891, p. 918) mention of a "project [that] has been formed of organizing a National Jewish Christian Church". In a communique he received from a "Hebrew", Schodde learned that "in a city in Southern Russia...a number of Jews hold secret meetings for reading the New Testament", and "in Lodz, Poland...a strong Jewish movement is now in progress, and the preaching of services are [sic] attended by 200-300 Jews".

While reports of "secret meetings" and large attendance may be exaggerated and impossible to verify, they were nonetheless influential in creating a climate back home of a burgeoning movement, which had international dimensions. But it was in the West where Hebrew Christian activities enjoyed the most prolific expression and financial backing, usually as an adjunct to mission work. The earliest known modern example in England of a Jewish Christian congregation was that founded by J. S. C. F. Frey who, shortly after

establishing the London Society for Promoting Christianity Among the Jews [LSPCJ] in 1809, purchased a church in Spitalfields and renamed it the Jews Chapel, installing himself as minister (Eichhorn, 1978, p. 23).

In 1813, the LSPCJ founded a second church, the Episcopal Jews Chapel in Bethnal Green. Also in 1813 a group of 41 Hebrew Christians formed the "B'nei Avraham" (Sons of Abraham), a society that met in the Episcopal Jews Chapel "for prayer and other purposes relating to the spiritual welfare of our brethren" (Eichhorn, 1978, pp. 23-4). When the first Jews Chapel closed in 1815, the Episcopal Jews Chapel inherited approximately 50 members.

There were other attempts to organize Jewish converts into "separate communions". Under the leadership of John Wilkinson, director of the Mildmay Mission, London, eleven such converts were united into a "Jewish-Christian Church", which met in the Mission for Sunday morning worship (Schodde, 1896, p. 278; Thompson, 1902, p. 112). A. C. Gaebelein (a.k.a. Gebelen)[37] of New York reported in his Yiddish missionary periodical Tikwas Yisrael (English edition, Hope of Israel and Our Hope) the organization of a similar congregation of 20 members. Referring to Gaebelein as if he were the leader of the group, possibly in his own Hope of Israel Mission, Schodde (1896, p. 278) noted that

> His position is practically that of Pastor G. A. Kruger of France [whose]

> program is more distinctively Jewish Christian than any other of its kind, and includes both the acceptance of Christ as the Messiah, and also the continuation of the observance of the Mosaic Law in so far as this is not contradictory to the fundaments of Christianity.

The most common form of Hebrew Christian assembly was that which met in Jewish missions. Eichhorn (1978, p. 187) categorically stated that "beginning in 1885 with Jacob Freshman's First Hebrew Christian Church in America in New York City, there were many so called Hebrew Christian Churches established in the U.S. and Canada; but until 1934 they were nothing more than run-of-the-mill missions". Among these must be counted the American Board of Missions to the Jews [ABMJ]. Founded by Leopold Cohn in 1894, it is the largest and longest running American mission to the Jews. In his autobiography, Cohn (1908, p. 51) referred to the Jewish converts of his mission as "gathered together and organized into a little Church" for whom a special prayer meeting was held every Monday morning. Yet, this little Church was apparently not all that Cohn had hoped for, and in recalling his wife's words before she died in 1908, quoted her as saying

> I have asked God to let me live to see the building and a Jewish Christian congregation worshipping the Lord in it, but He says no, just as to Moses when he wanted to enter the Promised Land (Cohn, 1908, pp. 54-5).

In 1909, the ABMJ acquired a mission building in Brooklyn, which Cohn named Beth Sar Shalom, and where he apparently performed all the functions of a church, including baptisms, Communion services, weddings, and funerals (J. H. Cohn, 1953, p. 188).

Unlike Cohn's ABMJ, which essentially had one man at the helm, some missions encountered opposition from their board members. The American Society for Meliorating the Condition of the Jews (1820-1870) had rented a mission house in New York City around 1845, but closed it in 1847 when it was suspected of "trying to establish a new Protestant sect, a separate Hebrew Christian church [with] the mission house [as] the headquarters of the new sect" (Eichhorn, 1978, p. 86). On the other hand, a quite tolerant attitude characterized the Episcopal Churches of New York, which in 1846 had enthusiastically donated funds to establish a "Jews Chapel", similar to the one in London. The Chapel, which had its own Hebrew Episcopal prayer book, closed after six years, when Episcopal support for it declined.

Other attempts to establish a Hebrew Christian church in America included the more than half dozen Hebrew Christian brotherhoods, which were organized during the mid- to late nineteenth century with that aim in mind. They all had short lives - only one lasting to two years - having succumbed to various disorders, such as interdenominational squabbles,

poor management, church opposition, and, finally, criminal dealings (Eichhorn, 1978, p. 130ff).

It was in Toronto, Ontario, however, where the first "legitimate" Hebrew Christian church on the North American Continent was established. In 1907 a subcommittee of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church, called the Jewish Mission Committee, appointed Reverend S. B. Rohold of Glasgow as missionary to the Jews in Toronto. In 1912 a new building was erected in the heart of a Jewish immigrant neighbourhood, and in 1913 it was dedicated and called the "Christian Synagogue". By 1920, Rohold, a converted Palestinian Jew, returned to his homeland to become Superintendent of the Mount Carmel Bible School in Haifa, under the British Jewish Society. The Christian Synagogue continued to function for two more years under Reverend J. McP. Scott, convener of the Jewish Mission Committee, until his death, when it was renamed the Scott Institute and it was opened to other nationalities (WMSPCC, 1927, pp. 91-2; Harney and Troper, 1975, p. 156).

The most surprising success among these and many similar experiments was that of David Bronstein. An ordained minister in the Presbyterian Church, Bronstein worked for the Peliel Community Centre in Chicago, a multi-facility mission located in the centre of an East European Jewish neighbourhood. Bronstein successfully petitioned the Presbyterian Church for permission to set up a Hebrew

Christian church separate from the Centre, and, in 1934, the First Hebrew Christian Church of Chicago was founded. The Presbyterians later established three other Hebrew Christian churches in major cities (Rausch, 1982, p. 100).

The work of David Bronstein and his son David Bronstein Jr., would have far reaching effects on the course of Hebrew Christian history, in particular, its present day congregational movement, Messianic Judaism. This development would be along time coming, however, due in some measure to the formation of the Hebrew Christian Alliance of America, perhaps the single most important Hebrew Christian organization.

The Hebrew Christian Alliance of America

Many of the organizations that emerged as part of the Hebrew Christian movement did not last for posterity in their original form, and some, like the repeated attempts to organize Jewish converts into Hebrew Christian "colonies" both in America and Palestine,[38] hardly got underway before they folded. But the founding in 1915 of the Hebrew Christian Alliance of America successfully culminated previous similar efforts, such as the B'nei Avraham already mentioned, the Hebrew Christian Alliance formed in London in 1866, and the Hebrew Christian Prayer Union, organized in 1882. The latter, which boosted a membership of 600 by 1890,

had as "its objects [the] promotion of unity, piety, and brotherly feelings amongst Jewish converts, by means of mutual prayer and religious intercourse" (Jocz, 1953, p. 244). The Hebrew Christian Alliance had identical aims, some of which are evident in the address given by Reverend A. M. Meyer at its initial meeting:

> Let us not sacrifice our identity. When we profess Christ, we do not cease to be Jews; Paul, after his conversion, did not cease to be a Jew; not only Saul was, but even Paul remained, a Hebrew of the Hebrews. We cannot and will not forget the land of our fathers, and it is our desire to cherish feelings of patriotism...As Hebrews, as Christians, we feel tied together; and as Hebrew Christians, we desire to be allied more closely to one another (Schonfield, 1936, p. 222).

Similarly, the Hebrew Christian Alliance of America in its first annual conference in April, 1915, voiced concern about

> ...how to stop the constant leakage of some of Israel's noblest sons and daughters getting Gentilized through their conversion, and thus becoming a dead loss to their nation (HCAA, 1915, p. 2).

The American Alliance would continue to be a forum, both in its annual conference and its quarterly publication (The American Hebrew Christian), for the heretofore diffuse voice of American Hebrew Christians. It self-consciously towed a moderate line between the separatist impulses of some of its membership and the assimilationist trends to "Gentile"

Christianity. Both of these tendencies continued, however, and while some warned against the excesses of "Judaising" others argued for the distinction between, on the one hand, heretical Judaising, which attached redemptive significance to its practices and, on the other hand, the necessary conservation of Jewish traditions, which distinguish the Jewish people as the inheritors of the Abrahamic covenant.

And yet the Hebrew Christian Alliance of America was not simply an organization for Jewish converts to Christianity, for basic to its self-understanding was that a converted Jew chooses to become a Hebrew Christian.

> A "Hebrew Christian" to give sense to the term, must acknowledge himself both a Hebrew and a Christian. It means that a Jew who accepts baptism with a view to losing his identity is not a Hebrew Christian though he may be a Christian (Jocz, 1953, p. 230).

Indeed, the American Alliance repeatedly emphasized the voluntariness and the common spirituality which ought to accompany membership and unification:

> We firmly advocate and believe that our unification ought entirely to be based upon a spiritual plane (HCAA, 1916, p. 46).

> The objective unity suggested must be viewed in the light of our individual attitude towards this unification. There must be the individual desire for such a relationship (HCAA, 1916, p. 47).

Jocz (1953, p. 231) summarized the basis of the Hebrew Christian unification thus:

> It is, however, our intention to point out that apart from the bond of blood there is a spiritual experience common to all Hebrew Christians, which is the basis of their external unity.

Summary

If Hebrew Christianity originated partly as a consequence of Evangelical theology, which looked upon the Jews as a uniquely Biblical race, who might still recognize "their messiah", it also grew up around the missiological problems which were associated with realizing that hope. Thus, the theological distinction of the Jews had its counterpart in the missionary work among them, and eventually led to the Hebrew Christians' own self-conscious assertion of their uniqueness. The Hebrew Christian Alliance of America became the largest vehicle for that expression.

ENDNOTES FOR CHAPTER TWO

[1]In a directory that does not claim to be exhaustive, published in the International Missionary Council's The Christian Approach to the Jew (a report of two conferences on that subject held at Budapest and Warsaw in 1927, [hereafter IMC], pp. 198-203), 15 Jewish missions with numerous satellites, founded between 1809 and 1900 in Great Britain and Ireland, are listed. Eighteen Jewish missions, founded between 1878 and 1921 in North America, are listed. Many more missions to Jews were begun during the nineteenth century but did not survive to the year 1927 when the above directory was compiled. A. Thompson in A Century of Jewish Missions (Chicago: F. H. Revell Co., 1902), pp. 277-82, lists 32 in North America, 28 in the United Kingdom, and 29 elsewhere. See also David Max Eichhorn's Evangelizing the American Jew (Middle Village, N.Y.: Jonathan David Publishers, 1978) for details of missionary efforts from the seventeenth century up to the present in the United States and Canada.

[2]The American Jewish Yearbook of 1901-02 documents the Jewish population increase from 3,000 in 1818 to 1,058,135 in 1900, with 400,000, the highest concentration, in New York (Thompson, 1902, pp. 60-5). By 1917, the total figure would more than triple to 3,389,000 (Daniel J. Elazar, Community and Polity, the Orgaizational Dynamics of American Jewry. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1976), p. 38.

[3]B. Z. Sobel, in his Hebrew Christianity: The Thirteenth Tribe (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1974), p. 196, observed that

> ...fundamentalist groups...in great part made Hebrew Christianity possible by their affirmation of dispensationalism, emphasizing the eschatological relevance of empirical Israel.

[4]In the translator's preface to Gustaf H. Dalman's essay Christianity and Judaism (originally delivered in 1898 in Berlin for the Evangelical Union), the Reverend G. H. Box, Hebrew Master at Merchant Taylor's School, London, noted:

> Some will naturally form a much higher and more favourable estimate of Zionism than is here given [by Dr. Dalman]. Others, again, especially those whose ecclesiastical circumstances have given them the opportunity of seeing what vitality and power of persistence for good have been actually realized by the idea of a national Church such as that with which we in England are familiar will find it hard to believe that the ideal of a Hebrew Christian national Church is so unlikely a consummation as Dr. Dalman thinks (Dalman, 1901, p. 8).

[5]Evangelical Christianity in this text refers to the per-millenialists and not the a-millenialists. The former, who eventually were referred to as Fundamentalist Evangelicals, believed that Jesus would return to the Holy Land to rule for a millenium, and that the Israel of the Bible was the Jewish people, who also would return and experience the fulfillment of biblical prophesies concerning them. In contrast, the a-millenialists, who came to be known as Liberal Evangelicals, did not believe in a millenium, and did not interpret Biblical Israel as the Jewish people but as the Church. According to them, "the spiritual blessings prophesied in the bible concerning the Kingdom of God [were] being fulfilled by the Church" (Rausch, 1979, p. 12).

[6]Reverend J. S. Stamp noted in a pamphlet, first published in 1843 by the British Society for the Propagation of the Gospel Among the Jews, London, that

> We briefly advert to the sacred Scriptures, and see what they declare upon the subject under consideration; in doing which we remark, that a single passage is not found in the whole volume, which speaks of the final rejection and abandonment of the Jewish nation (1846, p. 9).

[7]Franz Delitzsch, in "Biblical Thoughts on the Conversion of the Jews" (translated by G. H. Schodde for the Missionary Review of the World, Vol. 3, 1890), pp. 575-79 wrote that in addition to recognizing Jesus as the Messiah and gaining the possession of the land, "Israel will help in completing the evangelization of the world" (p. 579). A. W. Goodnow, in "The Jews and Eschatology", Baptist Quarterly

Review, Vol. 14 (1892), p. 451, wrote

> But the most noticeable of all is the Jews come to the front in the last act of earth's drama, in each covenants and prophesies and promises to them - long slumbering in the centuries past - have their fulfillment (Is. lx).

A. C. Gaebelein, in "The Time to Favour Zion", The Missionary Review of the World, Vol. 10 (1897), pp. 899-900, wrote:

> And is there a future national conversion of Israel promised by the true and living God? Yes. Israel is to be saved yet with an everlasting salvation - a nation born in a day and wonderfully restored to the land...Hundreds and hundreds of passages could be quoted from Holy Writ showing what good things God has promised to Israel to be fulfilled in His own time.

[8]To be sure, much of this literature, like Werner Sombart's The Jews and Modern Capitalism (originally published in London, 1913, reprinted New York: Burt Franklin, 1969) and the papers read at the Jewish Conference, Edinburgh, February 21, 1917, The New Jewry: A Challenge to the Church (Edinburgh: Publications Office, 1917), was intended to alert Christians to the social, the economic, and the moral threats which modern Jewry posed.

[9]In "How Far is the Jewish Soil Prepared?" The New Jewry (1917), pp. 43-57, Reverend John A. Tweedie found hopeful signs within all areas of Jewry: education was breaking through the "religious exclusiveness of Judaism", Jewish orthodoxy was "veined through with vitalizing modern influences which awaken enquiry", among that part of Judaism engaged in "imitative Christian methods of knowledge of Jesus" (p. 56). Writing on "Christian Missions to Israel", The Missionary Review of the World, Vol. 12 (1899), pp. 890-01, W. T. Gidney interpreted a chart showing the populations and the territorial disposition of the Jews as proof that "the dispersion of the chosen people has been completely accomplished" (p. 891), a condition necessary for their evangelization and subsequent restoration (according to Romans XI:30, 31 and XI:15-26, 27, respectively). See also IMC (1927, p. 37, 178).

[10]See Delitzsch (1890, p. 577); J. E. Mathieson, "The

Evangelization of the Jew", The Missionary Review of the World, Vol. 7 (1894), p. 905. J. H. Buckner in Jewish Evangelism, A Study: How to Win a Son of Abraham to the Son of God (Berne, Indiana: Light and Hope Publications, 1950), p. 17 noted that

> this covenant with Abraham has now become an unconditional national covenant and never has, and never can be abolished.

A. W. Goodnow (1892, p. 447), admonished Christians:

> Let us not forget that the Jewish people are still under a covenant and covenant-keeping God, and this fact is made prominent by the prophets and in the New Testament.

[11]Gidney (1899, pp. 889-90), viewed the rise of Jewish nationalism within the framework of Biblical prophecy:

...The Jews in their present scattered state present the spectacle to those who can look a little beneath the surface of things, of a people awaiting a resurrection to national life, and they are exhibiting certain unmistakable signs of awakening from their long sleep of national death. The vision of Ezek. XXXVII has not yet been worked out...Whether Dr. Herzl, or any other leader of the "Zionist" cause, will succeed in working out Ezekiel's vision, and reestablishing a Jewish state in Palestine, remains to be seen. Their object is clearly a political one only, but to us who believe in an overruling Providence, whose word must one day come to pass, it is a movement fraught with immense religious possibilities.

Some Christian observers remained skeptical about the effects a Jewish state would have on the Jews' conversion, a prerequisite to their restoration. While W. J. Couper in "Jewish Nationality Since the Time of Christ", The New Jewry (1917), p. 12, found it

> ...almost impossible to believe that its leaders would be more liberal towards Christianity than their fathers have been [,]

he also believed

> It is unlikely that they would

> legislate to prevent Christian propaganda...

Finally,

> there would be all the advantage of having a community of considerable size as a mission field (p. 13).

W. T. Morton in "The Jewish Problem of Today", The New Jewry, p. 24, was less equivocal, asserting that

> ...from a Christian point of view, Zionism is no adequate solution [to political freedom]. In fact, it might rather make the problem more difficult, in that it would help to entrench Judaism. The more the Jews are banded together, the more are they bound to the Synagogue, and the less are they open to receive the Gospel.

[12]No mere dabbler in international affairs,

> [i]n 1892 Blackstone secured the signatures of the rulers of thirty-six nations, including Benjamin Harrison, twenty-third president of the United States, on a document declaring that war should be outlawed as an instrument of international policy. This document was one of the most important steps in the process that led to the establishment of the Permanent Court of Arbitration at the Hague in 1899. After the first Basic Conference, Blackstone became an ardent exponent of the Zionist dream of Theodore Herzl. In 1916 Richard Gottheil declared that Blackstone's efforts on behalf of the Zionist cause had been of great value to the movement. While Blackstone ardently desired the conversion of the Jews, his efforts in this direction were completely free of guile (Eichhorn, 1978, pp. 166-67).

[13]William E. Blackstone, "Palestine for the Jews", memorandum presented to President Harrison (March 5, 1891).

[14]William E. Blackstone, "May the United States Intercede for the Jews?", Our Day, Vol. 8, No. 46 (October, 1891).

[15]Bartley C. Crum, Behind the Silken Curtain (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1947), pp. 15-16.

[16]See, among others, Baron (1897, p. 890); Buckner (1950, p. 11); Chalmers (1902, p. 275); Stamp (1843, pp. 17-19); Thompson (1902, pp. 260-61).

[17]Missionary literature was often infused with statistics which showed the inadequate number of missionaries working to convert Jews. Thus, Gidney (1899, pp. 895-896), calculated that there was only one missionary to every 30,000 Jews. But he added that this statistic was misleading, since the bulk of the Jews resided in Germany, Austria, and Russia, where the total number missionaries at work totalled only 53. See also IMC (1927, pp. 96-7).

[18]Irrespective of the elevated position of the Jew in the prophetic outlook, missionaries rarely failed to mention the "unfortunate" characteristics of the Jews. W. T. Morton (1917, p. 17ff), is particularly virulent, even as he documents the Jews' oppression in Europe. Indeed, one of the evils of this oppression, according to Morton, is that it produces

> a steady stream of emigration from the sphere of modern Jewry to the West, thereby adding considerably to the difficulties of the social and religious problems of Western nations (Morton, 1917, p. 21).

There was no consensus, however, on whether the secular or the traditional Jew created more problems for Christian society. In one article, Gidney (1899, p. 896), averred:

> In other words, the good and pious Jew is more promising material than the reformed Jew, who has thrown off religion altogether.

In the following paragraph, however, Gidney is less charitable:

> In England, it may almost be asserted, Judaism would ere now have been absorbed into Christianity, nominal or otherwise, had it not been

> periodically and continually reenforced by the pious and bigoted arrivals from Poland, who keep the already "Anglicized" Jews up to the mark religiously (Gidney, 1899, p. 897).

And while the Evangelicals roundly criticized the Reform movement as religionless, they nonetheless recognized that the modernism and secularism affecting Jewry implanted a curiosity among the latter and a willingness to communicate about their religious differences. See, among others, Baron (1896, p. 893); Chalmers (1902, pp. 270-1); Gidney (1899, p. 890); IMC (1927), pp. 7-8, 11, 20-1, 36, 96.

[19]In the chapter, "The Findings of the Warsaw Conference" (IMC, 1927, pp. 36-37), the writer declared that the economic and social progress of the Jews, their "passion for education", the rise of Zionism, which "implies a protest against unworthy assimilation", as well as "some of the new developments in Judaism [that] may be fraught with greater danger to the world unless they are directed into Christian channels", - all were reasons that "there is a special urgency today to evangelize the whole Jewish people - the fifteen and a half million Jews of the present-day `dispersion'. This very dispersion," he added," is a call of God to His Church".

[20]IMC (1927, p. 43, 170).

[21]According to Sobel (1974, p. 171, n. 73):

> The New York legislature refused a charter to the Society for the Evangelization of the Jews because, as they put it, the proselytizing of citizens is forbidden by the Constitution. The name was changed then to the American Society for Ameliorating the Condition of the Jews (chartered April 14, 1820).

[22]New England clergy witnessed the rise in the late eighteenth century of a faction, including incipient rationalists, Deists, Unitarians, and Universalists, which was influenced by the European Enlightenment. William G. McLoughlin, in Revivals, Awakenings and Reform (University of Chicago Press, 1978), p. 99, described them in the following way:

> Though differing widely among

> themselves they generally opposed the doctrines of predestination and innate depravity, arguing for freedom of the will and universal salvation.

[23]Under the subheading "Who Came to America?", Daniel Elazar (1976, p. 32), stated:

> As a general rule, the Jews who came to the United States were ordinary people - potential merchants and traders, not scholars. They were the more cosmopolitan and worldly, not people whose primary concern was Jewish life. In other words, they were Jews most predisposed to departing from the path of traditional Judiasm.

Certainly, the Evangelicals were fond of quoting the rate at which Jews were falling away from their faith or joining others. In "The Present Situation in Jewry", for example, the writer states:

> On the religious side, from country after country it is reported that the majority of educated Jews have turned to agnosticism or atheism...It is stated that in America 80 percent have given up Judaism...A considerable number of them in America has turned to "Christian Science", in Hungary to Theosophy and Spiritualism, in many lands to Zionism and Nationalism. (IMC, 1927, p. 95).

[24]Reform Judaism presented challenges on several fronts to the spread of the gospel. First, its claim to have a universal mission "to bear witness to the unity of God" conflicted with the aim of the Christian mission (Baron, "Israel's Mission to the World, and the Church's Mission to Israel", Missionary Review of the World, 1897, p. 889). Second, Reform's rationalist spirit was apparently more contemptible than "the Talmudism of the more consistent orthodox `Jew', who still wears his caftan and peyoth" (Baron, "The Jewish Question: Notes of a Recent Mission Tour", Missionary Review of the World, 1896, p. 891). Schodde (1891 p. 918), recognized that when faced with the Reform Jews ("radicals"),

> ...the Gospel messenger has double

> labour, because he must meet them as Jews and as rationalists...Western Judaism is not hopeless, but it is probably as difficult a field as the Gospel messenger can select...Strange to say, the East is more promising. And yet the Oriental Jew is the personification of Talmudism. He has however, the virtue of being deeply religious, and hence not closed to religious argument and persuasion.

See also Thompson (1902, p. 225), where Reform Judaism is likened to worshipping in "the gilded temple of Maimon".

[25]The New York legislature's refusal to grant a charter to the Society for the Evangelization of the Jews (see footnote 21) was prompted by the protest of the city's Jewish community (Eichhorn, 1978, p. 43). About 50 years later, the Jewish community would have its most ardent defender in

> Adolph Benjamin, a recent Jewish immigrant whose antimissionary activities made him hated and feared by Jewish missionaries in the 28 years he spent combatting their efforts (Eichhorn, 1978, p. 113).

His crusade, which was privately subsidized by the banker, Jacob Schiff, exposed numerous imposters, such as the "ex-rabbi" Professor Emanual H. Schlamovitz, Mordechai Rosenthal, alias Max Louis Rosevalley (and several other pseudonyms), Aris Hirschmann, alias "ex-rabbi" Aris Lichtenstein, Herman Paul Faust, and the two most notorious missionaries with criminal backgrounds, Hermann Warszawiak and Leopold Cohn, the latter, founder of the American Board of Missions to the Jews, whose real name was Itsak Lieb Joszovics. See Irving Howe, World of Our Fathers (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1976), p. 73 and Eichhorn (1978, pp. 113, 137, 140, 143, 148, 151, 155, 164-65, 168, 173, 178-80). Thompson (1902, pp. 116-17), also noted that

> Strenuous efforts are put forth by the Rabbis to offset the missionary's methods. His schools, reading rooms, dispensaries, hospitals, bible classes and lectures are duplicated, for the old cherem or Rabbinical edict, against the work no longer avails. In spite of all this studied opposition,

> the gospel is permeating English Jewry.

[26]In the "Findings of the Budapest Conference" (IMC, 1927, p. 19), the difference between the Jewish and the other non-Christian religions is pointed out:

> In the religion of Israel there are ideas of culture and principles of morality which are not to be found in other non-Christian religions. The Jew and the Christian have in common the Old Testament which is the vehicle of God's revelation to mankind, a heritage not enjoyed by other non-Christian religions. The Jew, moreover, has a unique consciousness of his role in the purpose of God for the salvation of the world.
>
> Therefore, in approaching the Jewish religion in distinction from other non-Christian religions, regard should be paid to this religious heritage of Israel. The difference in the religious approach between the followers of other non-Christian religions and of Judaism is that the one is led to God through Christ, while the Jew is led to Jesus Christ through his previous knowledge of God, however incomplete.

[27]Some of those committed to Jewish missionary work were so burdened by the inadequacy of the evangelizing effort that they tended to exaggerate the problem. Reverend T. M. Chalmers wrote that "after eighty years of spasmodic effort there exists in America today no properly equipped mission to the Jews" (1902, p. 274). But the editor added in a footnote that "the writer means that there is no mission that has all of the necessary facilities for a comprehensive work". Chalmers' assertion that "not half a dozen ordained men are at work in the whole field [in America]" is undoubtedly an underestimation, given the number of missions, both denominational and independent, which were operating in America at that time.

[28]It goes without saying that one frequent reason cited for the disinterest in missions to Jews was the deep-rooted antipathy toward them. See for example, Chalmers (1902), p. 271 and Reverend J. F. Philip, "Home

Organizations" in New Jewry (1917, p. 59). See also footnote 8, above.

[29]Some of the most well known and important Jewish missionaries, such as Joseph Samuel Christian Frederick Frey, founder of the London Society for Promoting Christianity Among the Jews (better known as the London Jews Society), Herman Warszawiak, employed by the New York City Mission and Tract Society, and Leopold Cohn top the list for scandal, deceit, and crime; others, who absconded with the charitable donations or who claimed to be "ex-rabbis" also fill the roster of these missionary pioneers. See Eichhorn (1978, pp. 18-26, 134-38, 163-65, 167-76) and David A. Baron, "Israel's Mission to the World" (1897, pp. 895-96), regarding "imposters". See also Reverend Joseph Wolff, Travels and Adventures of the Rev. Joseph Wolff, D. D., L. L. D. (London: Saunders, Otley and Co., 1861), pp. 80, 82 88, 170; IMC (1927, pp. 19-20); HCAA (1915, pp. 9, 32-33, 44 [sec. 3]); HCAA (1916, pp. 11, 63-4). Thompson (1902), p. 252.

[30]For example, Gidney (1899, p. 897), noted:

> The clergy of the Establishment church receive valuable aid from the Jewish missionary societies in the way of men fully qualified for work or monetary grants wherewith to fund the supply of such helpers.

Compare the "Answers to a Questionnaire" (IMC, 1927, p. 108), where the merits of a Hebrew Christian missionary are weighed against the Gentile - with the latter gaining the balance of favour.

[31]Curtiss, "The Present Condition of Jews in Russia", (1898), p. 925. East European Jewry, particularly in the Pale of Settlement, were believed to be more open to the Christian message than the secular, rational Jewry in the West. See Schodde (1891, p. 918); Philip (1917, p. 51); Gidney (1899, p. 896), who stated:

> In other words, the good and pious Jew is more promising material than the reformed Jew, who has thrown off religion altogether. We think it will be found that the greater proportion of Hebrew Christians are Polish Jews.

Also see Baron (1896).

[32]Schodde noted in "Gospel Work in Israel" (1896, p.

280):

> The Mildmay Mission [in London] alone in 1893 disposed of 18,406 Hebrew New Testaments and 69,657 parts of the Testament in the jargon [Yiddish]. Since the beginning of this literary propaganda, in all 208,313 Hebrew New Testaments have been used and 467,577 parts in the jargon.

[33]Compare Eichhorn (1978, p. 23):

> The London Jews Society, the name by which the LSPCJ was best known for many years, was composed chiefly of members of the Church of England, although its membership also included some other denominations, mostly Dissenters and Quakers.

[34]Schonfield (1936, p. 225), noted that Rabinowitz was baptized only in 1885.

[35]Lichtenstein was well known in missionary circles for his publications, which were impassioned pleas for Jews to recognize "their messiah". See "Two Letters; or What I Really Wish" (1887, translated by David Baron) and "A Jewish Mirror or The Scriptures Reflecting Christ" (n.d., translated by Mrs. David Baron) and "The Points of Contact Between Evangelical and Jewish Doctrine" (1908, translated by Mrs. David Baron). The latter was an address delivered at Leipzig to a Christian audience.

[36]This is likely the same organization referred to in IMC (1927, p. 199), as the Hebrew Christian Testimony to Israel, London, which had a station in Budapest.

[37]Eichhorn (1978, p. 153) stated that although Gaebelein was not a Jew, he "could speak Yiddish so fluently that he was often supposed to be a converted Jew". See also David Rausch "Arno C. Gaebelein (1861-1945): Fundamentalist Protestant Zionist", American Jewish History, Vol. 68 (September, 1978), pp. 43-56.

[38]See Jocz (1953, p. 242); IMC (1927, pp. 173-76); HCAA (1916, pp. 97-8); Eichhorn (1978, pp. 37-44), who noted the original purpose of the Society for Meliorating the Condition of the Jews was to form a Hebrew Christian settlement in the U.S.A.

CHAPTER THREE

Hebrew Christianity on the Church-Sect Continuum

The largest representative body of Hebrew Christianity, the Hebrew Christian Alliance of America, asserted its cultural and doctrinal difference from normative Christianity, while it also exhibited antagonism toward the latter's indiscriminate imposition on the Jews. Yet it resisted a formal break with the churches even as autonomous Hebrew Christian churches were founded and congregations functioned within missions virtually as ecclesiola in ecclesia (Wach, 1944, p. 173). In part, the difference between the HCAA and many individual Hebrew Christian satellites was due to the flagship organization's function as articulator of the Hebrew Christian ideal and the local organization's obligation to manage the practical consequences of living out that ideal. Thus, while Hebrew Christianity's raison d'etre which asserted the racial bond and national significance of the Jewish people, had both a Biblical basis and the support of pre-millenialist Evangelical churches, it nevertheless fostered alienation from the Gentile church and its practices.

This chapter will employ the church-sect continuum devised by Stark and Bainbridge (1979, 1980) to guide the exploration of the varying levels of "tension" or "sub-cultural deviance" that characterized Hebrew Christianity's relationship to the Christian community.

Difference

Within the Evangelical movement certain theological ideas, particularly the focus on Israel, its chosenness, and its restoration were particularly sympathetic to the rise of Hebrew Christianity. In addition, the intense missionary efforts of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, which spawned and funded many Jewish missions and Hebrew Christian missionaries, provided the structural context within which Hebrew Christian enclaves were established. Yet the difference between Hebrew Christianity and the Protestant establishment were significant, although not uniform, within the movement.

"Hebrew Christian"

The term Hebrew Christian owed as much to the Christian establishment's uncertain reception of the new convert as it did to the Jewish emigre's tentative acceptance of Christianity. Missionary journals and church publications commonly referred to Jewish converts as Hebrew- or Jewish-Christians, rarely as simply Christians.[1] As Jonathan D.

Sarna (1980, p. 27) put it:

> Christians viewed [first generation converts from Judaism] as Jews; Jews viewed them as Christians. Full-fledged members of neither group, Hebrew Christians set up a religious organization of their own.

The practice of identifying a Jewish convert as such certainly was rooted in a deep and enduring knowledge of the Jews as different from the pagan nations - as much for their historic connection to Christianity as for their legendary rejection of it. But Jews also were inclined, at times, to recognize the "Christian" Jew alongside other "types" of Jews, such as Marxist and Zionist (Kahler, 1939, p. 487).

While, undoubtedly, the majority of Jewish converts hoped to lose their former identification upon baptism and viewed with annoyance such reminders that Christians might make, some converts proclaimed their Hebrew difference with a discernible righteousness. Thus it was said of the well known itinerant missionary, Rev. Joseph Wolff, in the preface to his Travels and Adventures (1861) that

> he looks with pity upon those Jews who, though professing Christianity are ashamed of being known to the world as sprung from the Jewish stock.

Others, like the Rev. S. B. Rohold, not only acknowledged their Jewish stock, but argued further that they had not severed their connection to it. In response to a rabbi who castigated him as a "traitor", saying "You have

left the weak, and joined the strong; you have become Gentile", Rohold (1913, p. 142) declared:

> I emphatically deny such slander! I have not left my people! I have not become a Gentile!

Similarly, Rabbi I. Lichtenstein (1908, p. 13), whose missionary pamphlets written to his brethren in Budapest were published by David Baron's Hebrew Christian Testimony to Israel, London, admonished

> You need not, like withered leaves fall away from your ancient stock, or deny parents or nationality; you need not be unfaithful to the God of your fathers on account of reverence rendered the Son...

Indeed, Lichtenstein (1887, p. 25) regarded the typical renunciation of Jewish ties not only as unnecessary but also non-biblical.

> It is usually the endeavour of Jewish Christians in the very first generation to be rid of every Jewish impress, to amalgamate with the Christians, and be lost among others. The individual is lost, but the people remain. Israel, as the elect people, the everlasting witness to the peoples, cannot, ought not disappear in the tumult of the nations. For this we have a sure word, a divine pledge, "For I am the Lord, I change not; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed." (Malachai, iii, vi) "For as the new heavens and the new earth which I will make shall remain before Me, saith the Lord, so shall your seed and your name remain". (Isaiah, lxvi, 22)

Mathieson (1894, p. 907) also cautioned

> ...when a Jew accepts the heavenly citizenship (Phil. 3:20) he is not, he cannot be forgetful of his illustrious pedigree and the still more illustrious future of his nation.

But it was Arnold Fruchtenbaum (n.d., pp. 10, 19) who addressed the issue directly in his pamphlet, "Jewishness and Hebrew Christianity":

> Religiously, by faith, Hebrew Christians align themselves with other believers in Christ whether they be Jews or Gentiles. Nationally they identify with the Jewish people...Hebrew Christians never lose their Jewishness. Jewishness and Hebrew Christianity are not contradictory terms, but each complements and fulfills the other

The presumption of an enduring Jewish bond among Hebrew Christians, which distinguished them from Gentiles, would play a critical role in the missionary strategies employed. Moreover, the field open to them was set, for it was "for the Jewish Christian to go to the Jewish brother" (HCAA, 1916, p. 26). The HCAA was chief among the promoters of this evangelizing work, and in the resolution put forward by Max Reich (1916, pp. 48-9), the intent to further the cause of Hebrew Christian unity necessarily presupposed an existing solidarity with the Jewish people.

> Resolved by the Hebrew Christian Alliance of America in Conference assembled in Philadelphia, 1916 to send all the brethren of the House of Israel on this Continent a message of love and good will, an explanation of the deep feeling of its members, in spite of their seeming separation, of

> their unbroken attachment to their beloved nation whose true interests they are most anxious to serve...

While the belief in a fundamental bond among the Jewish people provided the foundation of Hebrew Christian unity,[2] it also suggested the way in which Hebrew Christians would bring the gospel to the Jews outside the church. Reverend J. H. Buckner, director of the Hebrew Christian Fellowship, Washington, D.C., began his instruction on "Approaching the Jew" (1950, P. 24) with the following directive:

> ...you are interested primarily in leading the Jew to know Him, not in changing his religion, not in turning him against Judaism, not in producing any kind of reform at all.

This passage and accompanying "lesson" also appears in Henry Heydt's Studies in Jewish Evangelism (1951, pp. 94-7), published by the largest Hebrew Christian missionary organization, the American Board of Missions to the Jews.

The view that the evangelization of the Christian message need not be at the expense of Judaism marked the modern missionary approach to the Jews. Jakob Jocz (1954, pp. 211-16) deplored the typical missionary propagandists' assault on Judaism, and documented the change to a more appreciative view of Judaism and its similarities to Christianity. To this largely academic phenomenon, apotheosized by Gustav Dalman's Christianity and Judaism (1901), Jocz (1954:222) added the one other feature which

> distinctively marks modern missions to Jews from the medieval attempt in this direction. It is the increasing recognition on the part of the Church that Jewish converts must not be segregated from the rest of their people.

This missionary approach, which was the hallmark of Hebrew Christianity and championed by the HCAA, was articulated several times in the IMC's Proceedings of the Budapest/Warsaw Conferences on the Christian Approach to the Jew (1927). Included in the methods of evangelizing the Jew was the following injunction:

> (e) Nothing should be done which would tend to alienate the [Jewish] pupils from their won people, and definite instruction might well be given in Jewish history, and, where desired by the parents, in the Hebrew language. (p. 21).

Further claims of maintaining Jewish integrity are found in the same report:

> We would not separate our Jewish friends from their past or rob them of their heritage, which is ours as well as theirs...(p. 28).

In his study of a Hebrew Christian fellowship-mission, "Messengers of the New Covenant", Sobel (1961:182) observed that most

> were convinced that the only factor holding the Jews back from wholesale conversion was the fallacious notion that this move would involve disloyalty to the ethnic configuration.

In response to such a notion, Hebrew Christians were frequently compelled to insist on their loyalty to Jews and Judaism. Thus, Arnold Fruchtenbaum (1974:14-15) quoted from an article in the Los Angeles Times written by a fellow Hebrew Christian, Marvin Lutzker:

> Statements referring to the "conversion" of the Jew to Christianity disturb me. I was born a Jew and will die a Jew. What does conversion imply? To me it implies the leaving behind of Jewishness and the acceptance of something quite foreign to Jewish thought, custom and belief...[Yet] I am more of a Jew now than ever before, because now I read my Old Testament with understanding and belief.

David H. Freeman (1982, p. 3) stressed the same idea of continuity when he counselled on how to bring the gospel to the Jews:

> Give them a New Testament. Offer to explain its meaning. Stress that to become a Christian is not to abandon being a Jew, but is rather to become a true Israelite.

While Hebrew Christians assert their differences from Protestant Christianity by insisting on their loyalty to the Jewish people and Judaism, it is clearly contingent on their uniquely Hebrew Christian understanding of both. Their commitment to Jewish people, for instance, is largely as missionaries who hope to bring the gospel to their "unsaved" brethren. Their understanding of Judaism is equally limited to what Lutzker called "basic Judaism", the acceptance of the

God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob and the verity of the Old Testament (Fruchtenbaum, 1974:15).[3] These unorthodox conceptions, although standing in contrast to Gentile Christianity, are nevertheless, inconsistent with Rabbinic Judaism. Thus, Fruchtenbaum (1974:59), a leading spokesman for Hebrew Christianity, admits:

> The relationship between the Hebrew Christian and the unbelieving Jewish community is one of paradoxes. He considers himself a member of the Jewish community but is not considered one by his fellow Jews. He is extremely loyal to the Jews yet is considered by them to be a traitor.

The Hebrew Christian presumption of "solidarity" with the Jewish population was also fundamentally paradoxical in a proselytizing movement. It nonetheless became the special task of the ABMJ to foster this "solidarity" while pursuing a missionary program. In countless pamphlets and a score of books, the ABMJ attempted to surmount the historical failure of Jewish missions by employ a missionary method that promised to preserve the cultural elements of Jewish life, which, it believed, were most highly valued by the Jew. By couching the Christian message in familiar terminology and purging it of terms that evoked images of persecution, the ABMJ attempted to retain the Jew's cultural ways and not offend his historical sensitivities. Thus, in a chapter on proper missionary terminology, the ABMJ booklet, Introducing the Jewish People to Their Messiah (1977:11) instructed:

> Don't say "Christian", say "Believer". To the average Jew "Christian" means gentile including Catholics, Protestants, true believers, and nominal church members.
>
> Don't say "Christ", say "Messiah". "Christ" is the god of the gentiles to a Jewish mind, and the name in which Jews have been persecuted for almost two thousand years. "Messiah"...is from the Hebrew meaning "Anointed One"...and is a familiar concept in Judaism.
>
> Don't say "convert", say "completed" or "fulfilled"..."Conversion is the thing most feared by Jewish people. Pagans may "convert", but Jews really return to the faith of Abraham fulfilled by the Messiah (Hebrews 11:8-16).
>
> Don't say "cross", say "tree". The cross has been a sign under which much persecution of Jewish people has taken place. It is also better to avoid display of a cross.
>
> Don't say "Old Testament" and "New Covenant"... it is better to USE the book [the N.T.] without placing emphasis on the name. Do be certain to emphasize the Jewishness of its writers. When possible, use "Holy Scriptures" or "Bible" for any reference.[4]

The practical advantages of this approach, which reduce Jewish resistance to the Christian message to "problems in semantics", are obvious - not to mention biblically justified by Paul's letter to the Corinthian church in which he boldly admitted:

> For though I was free of all men, I brought myself under bondage to all, that I might gain the more. And to

> the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, not being myself under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law (I Corinthians, 9:19-20).

An undated pamphlet, I Became as a Jew by Ruth Abraham, written some time after the 1967 Arab-Israeli war, put it bluntly: "I would hate to think that I kept someone from the Kingdom of God because of my vocabulary" (p. 8).

The Hebrew Christian "distinctive" was not only based on the belief in an ineradicable Biblical and ethnic bond between Jews as well as the creation of a Jewish missionary strategy, but it also was upheld by Jewish rituals and customs. To be sure, the extent to which Hebrew Christianity should incorporate Jewish law and customs was a disputed point, particularly in the early years of the HCAA (Sobel, 1974, pp. 229-31). Yet as long as they were not viewed as legally binding or as substituting for the justification of faith, their observation was largely unproblematic.

Arnold Fruchtenbaum (1974, p. 29), one of the leading apologists of a moderate Hebrew Christianity, insisted that "Hebrew Christians should have their sons circumcised on the eighth day" - according to the Abrahamic not the Mosaic covenant. This practice would ensure that the doctrine of the "remnant of Israel" would be fulfilled, for

> ...the Hebrew Christians are the remnant of Israel today. The remnant is always in the nation not outside of it; the Hebrew Christians, the

> present-day remnant, are part of Israel and the Jewish people. The Jewishness is distinct (p. 31).

Fruchtenbaum was more cautious about keeping the Law of Moses, which, according to the Church, has been supplanted by the Law of Christ. Having cited relevant passages, such as Galatians 2:16, Hebrews 7:19, and II Corinthians 3:2-11, which point to the abrogration of the Law of Moses, and concluding that Hebrew Christians were under the new law of Christ, Fruchtenbaum nonetheless ended the chapter by asserting a "principle of freedom". Under the latter, for which he found support in the actions of Paul (Acts, 18:8, 20:16, 21:17-26), Hebrew Christians are free to keep parts of the Law of Moses, including the observation of the laws of kashrut.

Apart from daily ritual observations, certain customs and festivals are also maintained, albeit in modified form. A Hebrew Christian wedding service follows the traditional Jewish one, incorporating the Talmudic benediction of betrothal (Ketubah 7b) and the blessing of the bridegroom (Ketubah 7b-8a), as well as the custom of the Hupa (canopy), the first and the second goblet of wine, and the breaking of the wine goblet at the end of the service (Fruchtenbaum, 1974, pp. 133-9).[5] The celebration of some or all of the Jewish festivals is also encouraged for the opportunity they provide not only to witness to "unbelieving Jewish people", but also to identify with them and to "instill...Jewishness

in the children of Hebrew Christians" (Fruchtenbaum, 1974, p. 107).

It is noteworthy that this position is for all intents and purposes identical to that voiced by an early "radical" in the movement, Mark John Levy. Known as the champion of a very "Jewish" Hebrew Christianity, Levy (1917, p. 138) appealed to his co-religionists:

> We must now make it unquestionably [sic] to our non-Christian Jewish brethren that in the proclamation of this blessed truth we do not seek to Gentilize them or make them members of the Protestant Episcopal or any other branch of the Christian Church...for Jews, <u>though not compelled</u>, are ever left free in Christianity to exercise their Jewish national loyalty in Judah's spiritual favour.

<u>Antagonism</u>

The maintenance of a separate cultural Hebrew Christian identity within "the body of Christ" was necessarily contingent as much on the newcomers themselves as on the Church of which it claimed to be a part. That the Church might regard the Hebrew Christians' claim as an assertion of "privilege", even superiority, was all too evident to apologists for the movement. Hence, the frequent reassurances to the contrary. Fruchtenbaum (1974, p. 34), for instance, warned: "The fact that we are distinct from the Gentile Christian does not make us better. There is no

room for pride or a feeling of superiority". Protestations aside, Hebrew Christians were inclined to point out the various failings of Gentile Christianity as well as their alienation from it. In return, they were targets of suspicion and criticism.

Hebrew Christianity versus Gentile Christianity

It is essentially "the recognition that the missionary effort must not aim at `Gentilizing' the Jew" (Jocz, 1954, p. 223), and the belief that Gentile culture is a stumbling block to the Jew's conversion, that provided the rationale for the Hebrew Christian missiological "distinctive". But it was the conviction that the message of the New Testament was a theologically and historically Jewish message, that provided the basis for a Hebrew Christian critique of Gentile Christianity. The chief promoter and scholar of this view was Hugh Schonfield, considered authoritative for Hebrew Christianity, who asserted "...we cannot dissociate primitive Christianity from apocalyptic Judaism. We are dealing with one and the same thing" (1968, p. 84). The view that "the New Testament is just as much a piece of Jewish literature as the Old Testament" (Flynn, n.d., p. 6) had ample support in scholarly circles.

In so far as primitive Christianity was synonymous with apocalyptic Judaism, the cultural and religious accretions of the Gentiles, which have moved the Christian

message further away from its Jewish origins (especially in the case of the Roman Catholic Church), were considered false. Thus, did an early commentator on Hebrew Christianity, H. L. Ellison, point to the essentially unrecognizable Christianity found in the churches, and identify the central task of Hebrew Christians to point the way back to its true origins.

> ...if the Jew today feels that Christianity is an alien religion, it is in large measure due to the fact that popular Christianity is not the religion of the New Testament. Increasingly, it is being realized that the truth of the New Testament was during the second to fifth century [sic] poured into molds of thought that subtly changed it. The Reformation was another period of subtle change. As a result, while the Gospel is as much today as in the first century the power of God unto salvation unto every one that believeth, to the Jew first and also to the Gentile, there is much preached as Gospel truth that is one man's explanation of it. It may well be the principal task of Hebrew Christianity to feel its way back to the primitive apostolic simplicity of the Gospel, and then express it in thought forms that will speak to Jew and Hebrew Christian alike (1945, p. 10).

Addressing the First General Conference of the HCAA (1915), a member of the executive, A. R. Kuldell, reasoned that the increasing secularization of Jewry was caused by a similar condition in the Church. In Kuldell's view, it was incumbant on the HCAA to rescue both from this "contagious"

"apostasy from God".

> The Churches of Christ are losing faith in the Word of God. It seems to me, therefore that we as a Hebrew Christian Alliance have a task before us to raise up the standard of the true faith to both Jew and Gentile...as it is Judaism has come in touch in this land with an apostate Christianity...What Judaism needs today is pure Christianity (HCAA, 1915, p. 20).

The following year, the HCAA president, Rev. S. B. Rohold, voiced the same criticism as well as the same reformatory mission of Hebrew Christianity:

> ...the Christian Church, which has become weary is neither hot nor cold, being swayed by every wind of false doctrine, and apostate movement - losing faith in the living word of God. [Hebrew Christians] did not in the least overestimate what such a united Hebrew Christian Testimony would be in the Church; Yes, it will be "Life from the dead" (HCAA, 1916, pp. 3-4).

Thus, Hebrew Christianity was committed to "purifying" the Church into which it hoped to channel Jewish converts. This "clean-up" campaign focused primarily on ridding the churches of a pervasive anti-semitism. If the Church or "Christendom" was viewed as a stumbling block to the successful proselytization of Jews, it was partly due to the belief that, whereas true Christianity was fundamentally philosemitic, if not Jewish, false Christianity suffered from anti-semitism, if not "Gentilism". Not only was this construed as the reason why "millions of Jews do not know the

difference between those who are true Christians and those who are not" (Buckner, 1950, p. 25), but it also explained why the historical persecutors of Jews are erroneously identified as Christians. Buckner (1950, p.25) averred:

> Although the true Christian has always loved the Jews there have been many who have called themselves Christian who have persecuted the Jews.

In a pamphlet entitled "What is a Christian?" (n.d.), Joseph Hoffman Cohn defended the "true" Christian while also appearing to attack Jews for falsely identifying their persecutors as Christians:

> For instance, when we read of the terrible massacres of Jews in Russia, Germany and Poland and we hear some of our rabbis tell us that these massacres are being done by Christians, we know that is a falsehood, and that what our rabbis are telling us is not true. For if these people were really Christian they could not possibly massacre Jews.

Cohn's double edged sword is not apparent in the pamphlet, "Why We Haven't Won the Jew" by H. Edward Rowe, in which the author placed the blame squarely on "Christendom".

> The greatest enemy to Jewish evangelism is "Christendom". The most formidable enemy of the Jewish people from the fourth century to this day has been the "Christian Church". Not the real Body of Christ, but the Christian Church which the Jewish people have known.

Rowe (pp. 8-13) identified various traditions within Christendom, the Roman Church, Protestant Liberalism, Cults

and "with a flush of embarrassment" even Evangelicalism, all of which have perverted "true" Christianity and acted as an obstacle to Jewish evangelism. With regard to Evangelicalism, it is the notion of the "Gentile Church" which has perpetrated the "fallacy" that:

> ...the Jews have foreited their places in the plan of God, and that Gentiles now occupy that place. God is gathering out a Gentile Church, and individuals in that church are "spiritual Israelites" (p. 14).

The Gentile church was perceived to be un-Christian in so far as it practised "the worst form of anti-semitism", i.e., "withholding the gospel from the Jews" (Freeman, 1982, pp. 1-3). The liberal churches, which for various reasons did not conduct missions to Jews, were therefore obvious targets of Hebrew Christian attack. A particularly virulent condemnation is found in the ABMJ periodical, The Chosen People (Dec., 1925, p. 5):

> But at no point in the conduct and profession of a Modernist is his hypocrisy and treachery so completely unmasked as it is when he is brought face to face with the question of preaching the Gospel to the Jews. This is in a way the surest test in exposing the Modernist. For to tell the truth, the Modernist, away down in his heart, hates Jewish Missions. This is easily understandable when we once examine his theological position. For we will discover, perhaps in shocked amazement, that the theological beliefs of the present-day Modernist are identical with the beliefs of the Jews in the days when

> the Lord Jesus Christ was on the earth - beliefs which elicited more than once the crushing condemnation from the lips of our Lord, "Ye are of your father, the Devil".

Gentile Christianity versus Hebrew Christianity

So far, we have seen Hebrew Christianity's various characterizations of the Gentile Church as either historically or inherently guilty of "un-Christian" anti-semitism - the latter evident as much in the Church's persecution of Jews as in its tolerance (non-proselytising) of them. But it was as Hebrew Christians with aspirations to form a distinct community "in the body of Christ" that they believed themselves to be the target of yet more "un-Christian" anti-semitism or "Gentilism", these being considered synonymous.

Expected to shed their "Hebrew" distinctiveness and become identified with the denominations in which they were converted, Hebrew Christians were berated for their "undenominationalism". In this regard, Jocz (1954, p. 245) cited the bitter complaint of an "obviously Gentile" Anglican High Churchman:

> If a Jew is converted as a Plymouth Brother he must remain a Plymouth Brother if he is sincerely convinced that that form of faith be the true one; to pretend to be in communion with the Church would be hypocrisy on his part, because the Church teaches as vital truths things which a Plymouth Brother regards as utterly

> unnecessary; the same applies to members of each of the sects.

The target of this anonymous attack was the British organization, the Hebrew Christian Alliance and Prayer Union. A similar attitude apparently was directed toward the HCAA. During an address on the subject of disunity among Jewish missions, Reverand Elias Newman told the HCAA conference of 1916 that the situation exacerbated an already unfavourable position:

> This has given the enemy a good chance both among Jews who dislike us and the Christians who are suspicious of us (HCAA, 1916, p. 67).

Some twenty-five years later, Newman (1940, p. 24) recalled the opposition to the formation of the HCAA:

> Twenty-five years ago when we began to unite we were warned, we were threatened, we were cajoled, we were urged not to form such an alliance. It was supposed to be un-scriptural. We were (so they said) about to re-build the middle wall of partition. We had to watch our steps. If we wanted to eat a Jewish corned beef sandwich we were considered Judaizers. If we wanted to get married were told we must marry a Gentile and if we were imprudent to cast an eye upon one of those maidens, flesh of our flesh, we were considered in danger of apostacy, etc...

According to Schonfield (1936, pp. 230-1), the strained relationship between Hebrew Christians and the Church was partly due to their Christian idealism, uncoloured by the "subtler denominational distinctions". Such idealism

apparently was shared by Gideon R. Lederer (1804-1879), "a forgotten forefather of the Hebrew Christian church in the United States", about whom Sarna (1980, p. 31) wrote:

> Christians always considered him a Jew; as a Hebrew Christian, he agreed - proudly, he looked down on "the specialities of Gentile Christian denominations", and declared himself a strict adherent of "Peter's creed".

Primarily, however, it was the anti-semitic reception which awaited Hebrew Christians in the Church that accounted for the strained relationship between them. Schonfield (1936, p. 231) argued:

> Even worse, they found that they were not wanted in the Church, and were frozen out by ill-disguised dislike...The convert who had dared all for Christ's sake, and expected the warmth of his new brethren to solace him for what he had lost, was subjected to the torture of a loneliness which only the deepest faith could support.

Reverand Alfred A. Wiener, a Hebrew Christian missionary in southern Ontario, called this phenomenon an "inward segregation" of the Gentile church, which snubs, ignores or holds in contempt the Jewish convert - a "half conscious anti-semitic snobbery" that "our Jewish people are very quick to discern" (1965, p. 5). This scenario strengthened the resolve of Joseph Hoffman Cohn in the ABMJ's mission to the Church. In his autobiography, Cohn related an incident in which he invited a Jewish couple to a church, only to have them subjected to a pastor's virulent attack on the Jews who

crucified Christ. Cohn concluded:

> I realized more than ever before the strategic importance of our work in going about among the churches to break down the middle wall of partition and to make it possible that when a Jew enters a church he would find a Christ-like welcome and an open door of hospitality (1953, p. 236).

Evidence of the difficulties faced by Hebrew Christians in churches reaches back to the efforts of Leopold Cohn, the founder of the ABMJ. In a pamphlet entitled A Jewish Confession of Faith (n.d.), the author related that

> [Cohn] struggled heroically to get these believers into some of our Brooklyn, New York churches, that they might enjoy fellowship there. But at times this proved even more difficult than winning Jews to Christ. There were mis und erstandings, there were differences in cultural backgrounds, very few of the converts knew English, and there was also a certain amount of prejudice, though the pastors did their best to overcome that.

Decades later, The Chosen People (Dec. 1961, p. 11), echoed the same disappointment in the churches' intransigent attitude of the Jews in their midst, noting that "the matter of church affiliation for our Christian Jews is often a problem, for sad to say, they are not always welcome in Gentile groups".

One of the factors, which the above article (p. 11) identified as determining a Hebrew Christian's church affiliation (and reception) was his doctrinal convictions.[6]

A particularly dramatic account of the problems they might create is given in Joseph Hoffman Cohn's autobiography. Cohn encountered bitter hostility when he sought ordination after his father died and left the ABMJ in his trust. Turned down by his own church, he went to Grand Rapids, Michigan where he finally achieved his goal - but not without a further upheaval caused by his own declaration that the Lord's Supper was actually the Jewish Passover, and that when the disciples went from house to house breaking bread with each other, they merely were practicing the Jewish custom of breaking bread and not the Lord's Supper. Apparently, "saved" by the intervention of a sympathetic minister, this episode in Cohn's career was appropriately titled "Almost a Heretic" (pp. 192-3).

More often than not the Hebrew Christian's alienation from the Church took less dramatic form. However, a generalized feeling, such as that uttered by Mark John Levy (HCAA, 1915, p. 9) that "the Gentiles misunderstand us" gave rise to a discernable martyr complex. Thus did President Rohold's address to the HCAA conference of 1916 voice the sense of the Hebrew Christian's alienation and compare it to that experienced by Jesus, himself:

> As Hebrew Christians, we, who have been born again know what the Saviour experienced, in being led away into the wilderness and in being tempted by the devil. We know also what it means to be hated of all men...(HCAA, 1916, pp. 13-14).

Similar references were made by the Reverend A. Cairns (1926, p. 122) whose vision of the Hebrew Christian was one of the lonely martyr, who "walks calmly, though undaunted, up the Golgothas of family ostracism, gentile suspicion and rabbinical scorn". Finally, it was Jocz (1954, p. 259) who summed up the particular dilemma of the Hebrew Christian:

> The position of the Hebrew Christian is one of great loneliness. He finds himself outside both camps, standing midway. He is torn in two directions, between the Gentile Church and the Jewish people.[7]

Needless to say, the conscientious attempt to retain the separate national and cultural identity of Jewish believers in the churches, created a situation of social and theological unease. In addition to the encouragement of the Jew's cultural distinctiveness, Hebrew Christianity's expectation that they act as `watchdogs' for both anti-semitic activity and the Gentilization of traditions in the church (Fruchtenbaum, 1974, p. 96), placed them, at best, in a condescending relationship to their fellow members. The vigilante role of Hebrew Christians was not viewed simply as an attempt to redress the imbalance of history, but was believed to be their divinely appointed destiny as the "apple of God's eye" and the people of the Messiah Jesus. Such an ironic elevation of the Jew within the church as well as in Christian theology fostered suspicions that Hebrew Christianity was resurrecting the "middle wall of partition"

(Ephesians, 2:14) and undermining the universal message of Christianity.

Its response to accusations of this kind was a reiteration of the "united but different" interpretation of Paul's confession that "we are all one in Messiah, Jesus" (Galatians, 3:28). Emphasis was placed on Jesus' own Jewish identity, on the New Testament prescription to carry the gospel "to the Jew first", and on the dispensationalist view that "Christ will return to be Israel's king, and Israel is still to be Christ's own" (Sobel, 1966, p. 349; Fruchtenbaum, 1974, pp. 17-34). But these theological justifications only exacerbated both the fundamental difficulty of Hebrew Christianity's goals and the amiguity of its chosen reference group. Although its stress on the continuity between (Biblical) Judaism and Christianity was intended to convince the would-be proselyte that "Christianity is Jewish", it also caused some to view the movement as an attempt to "Judaize" Christianity or to form a fifth school of Judaism - a situation that neither the churches nor many of its followers found acceptable (Sobel, 1974, pp. 226-31; Sarna, 1982, p. 32).

Separation

Given the many factors, including cultural differences, historic anti-semitism, and doctrinal and

missiological emphases, contributing to a potentially high tension between Hebrew Christians and the Church, the solution that would seem to present itself was separation into a Hebrew Christian Church. Many different responses to this "obvious" solution were voiced or undertaken within the movement, and it would be impossible to document all of them. We already have seen in the previous chapter, however, the various organizations, among them congregations, which attempted to forge the Hebrew Christians into a viable religious identification, if not a denomination or sect.

The following brief survey of the Hebrew Christian responses to the "the separation issue" will provide the necessary backdrop to the subsequent chapter on the Messianic Jewish movement, which in 1975 decisively solved this central Hebrew Christian question.

Certainly the single most daring and successful Hebrew Christian was Leopold Cohn. Founder of the oldest and largest mission to the Jews, Cohn was an undaunted individualist, who managed to build up the ABMJ from meagre beginnings in spite of the criminal scandals which surrounded him for most of his life (Freuder, 1915, pp. 164ff). Yet there is evidence that Cohn aspired to more than a mission, and as early as 1915 he published an apologetic statement on why a large Hebrew Christian Church had yet to be established. Unlike the HCAA, which officially viewed this as a "dangerous" aim that could further erode the movement's

credibility, Cohn viewed the matter in more basic, practical terms:

> We could have had by this time a Hebrew Christian Church comprising many hundreds of members if we had them all together. The problem of how to keep them so as to form a large church, has been puzzling us for many years past. The main difficulty in doing this has been the employment question, because as soon as a Jew is known among his people as a follower of the Lord Jesus Christ he is taunted and annoyed, denied every privilege and turned out of work which he cannot secure among other nationalities (1915, pp. 8-9).

To what extent this was a convenient explanation for a much more complex problem remains moot, but it was already a familiar line of reasoning used by other missionaries to account for the failure of missions to Jews, generally (Jocz, 1954, p. 241).

Far from being a closed issue, the idea of a Hebrew Christian Church merited inclusion in the questionnaire summarized in the proceedings of the Budapest and Warsaw Conferences on "The Christian Approach to the Jew". There was no consensus on the issue, however, and the responses ranged from rejecting the idea - "Not in favour of a Hebrew Christian Church", "not desirable", "not practicable", "tending to division of the Body of Christ" - to endorsing it - "Many, on the other hand, are in favour of such a Church, considering it would prove a real service, and others regard

it as an ideal to be realized in the future". One respondent linked it to the Jewish state:

> A Hebrew Christian Church is impossible until a strong one is formed in Palestine and there is a Jewish state. At present Hebrew Christian associations should be formed (IMC, 1927, p. 109).

These considered opinions aside, Hebrew Christian churches and congregations were founded, as the same report documents, although with data on only a few of them, we might generalize that most were not long-lived. Reference was made, for instance, to the "Christian Synagogue" of Toronto (see p. 51, above), which "was discontinued on the advice of the Committee" (IMC, 1927, p. 109). Quite likely, this decision was taken as a result of the climate of Jewish opposition, which had already been inflamed by the vigorous street proselytization of a Hebrew Christian missionary. I. Singer, whose "field" was the same area of Toronto where the "Christian Synagogue" was located. The area, known as "the Ward" contained the densest Jewish immigrant population in the city of Toronto (Harney and Troper, 1975, p. 156).

The Hebrew Christian scholar, Jakob Jocz (1954, p. 239), was himself skeptical of the supposed appeal that a Hebrew Christian Church would have to the Jewish population. Noting that none of the efforts of Hebrew Christianity "won them a place in Jewry", he remained unconvinced by a co-religionist's contention that:

> ...if Christianity is to become a lasting and conquering power among Israel, it must lose its Gentile form and colour, and must become a Hebrew religion to the Hebrew as the Protestant religion is English to the English, German to the German, etc. (Philip Cohen, n.d., p. 43 in Jocz, 1954, p. 239).

Apart from his assessment of the limited appeal or effectiveness of a Hebrew Christian Church of the type envisaged by Cohen, Jocz (p. 239) also reiterated the standard Christian suspicion that it would be "an admission that the middle wall of partition between Jew and Gentile still exists" and, moreover, it would constitute "a sect and not a branch of the Church Catholic [universal church]". Further on, however, Jocz (p. 246) appeared not to have ruled out either the possibility or the value of a Hebrew Christian Church. In a section entitled "Hebrew Christian Influence", he noted that given the demands of denominational allegiance,

> ...there can be no question of a distinctive Hebrew Christian contribution to the life of the Gentile church. This can only be possible when there comes into existence a Hebrew Christian branch, living its free and independent life.

Jocz (p. 26Ø) seemed to have thought that this Hebrew Christian "branch" could come about only in Palestine:

> National continuity of Hebrew Christianity will only be possible when the Jewish people lives its own life upon its soil, and can afford to grant to its members the luxury of personal conviction without exchanging its separate [national] existence.

Jocz's view echoed that of the HCAA, whose constitution never included as a goal the formation of a Hebrew Christian Church. Indeed, that the suspicions aroused by the founding of the HCAA were recalled some twenty-five years later indicates how thoroughly dispelled or remote from reality they were by then: "Others were afraid the alliance would only lead to the formation of a Hebrew Christian Church. Hebrew Christians must not unite. Union was only for Gentiles" (Newman, 1940, p. 24).

In the early years, at least, such suspicions would have been justifiably aroused, notwithstanding Max I Reich's warning to the first general conference of the HCAA "of the danger of setting up a separate Jewish Church in which the glorious truth of the oneness of all believers in the Body of Christ...is but feebly apprehended and acted upon" (HCAA, 1915, pp. 1-2). The following year, the introduction to the proceedings was given by the HCAA's first President, S. B. Rohold, whose address was given as the "Christian Synagogue", Toronto, Canada! In fact, some Hebrew Christians writing in the Hebrew Christian Alliance Quarterly did argue for the necessity of a Hebrew Christian Church, primarily on the grounds that it would be an effective means of evangelizing the Jews through a corporate witness (Sobel, 1974, pp. 232-6).

The International Hebrew Christian Alliance

experienced a similar ambiguity. Although it set up a Commission at its 1931 conference "to enquire into the desirability and practicability of forming a Hebrew Christian Church", and passed a resolution at the next conference "That this Conference approves the principle of the establishment of a Hebrew Christian Church" (Schonfield, 1936, p. 243), the record shows no evidence of such a Church being erected (Sobel, 1974, p. 247, n. 45).

Certainly, the hesitancy to separate was not entirely dependent on the anticipated opposition by the Jewish and the Christian communities. Perhaps more decisive was the lack of consensus in the Hebrew Christian community concerning its missionary mandate as well as the content and practice of its religious devotions. The internal divisions within Hebrew Christianity on these issues were evident early on. Indeed, S. B. Rohold (HCAA, 1916, p. 40) averred that "to unite Hebrew Christians in matters of doctrine or forms of Church government...is not possible". In a "special paper" on "The Question of a Hebrew Christian Colony in Palestine", the Reverand Rennie Mac Inness stated that a Hebrew Christian colony could not come about until a Hebrew Christian Church was established, with "a definable minimum of faith and practice and Church government". He asked "Does such a recognisable group exist? ...Has any group, however small, propounded such a combination of Christian belief and Jewish practice as commended itself to any other group?" (IMC,

1927, pp. 174-5).

Answer came there none. For without the co-operative efforts of the largest Hebrew Christian organizations, the idea of a Hebrew Christian Church would not amount to more than a few isolated congregations. One of the obvious reasons for this hesitancy was Hebrew Christianity's unwillingness to trade loyalty to the Jewish nation for loyalty to the Church, a situation that Jocz (1954, p. 260), for one, was aware would move it beyond the sectarian pale. This might have been acceptable were it not for the fact that the acceptance and the financial support of the Christian community were crucial if this novel Jewish version of Christianity was to have any semblance of legitimacy and survive into the future.

Without this "legitimacy" Hebrew Christianity hardly could claim to have any influence in the Church, let alone a "purifying" one (Fruchtenbaum, 1974, p. 96). Indeed, it is this role of Hebrew Christianity which became ascendent, particularly through that the missionary model of the ABMJ. Supported largely by individual Christians and churches who endorse its missionary efforts to Jews (Blumstock, 1968, p. 30), the ABMJ, in turn, holds annual two-week "prophetic conferences" in which "field evangelists" preach to as many as 30 churches in a given region, each church hosting between one and five guest sermons. Among the topics on the agenda

are "The Jews, the Gentile and the Church of God", "Jewish Missions Through the Ages", and "The Prophetic Significance of the Jewish Holy Days".[8]

To serve Hebrew Christianity locally, the ABMJ operates Hebrew Christian Fellowships,

> ...where believing Jews can come together as often as they like...to meet the needs of the new believers, hold children's classes in Jewish studies, become a centre for Jews to reach out to unbelieving Jews, and be a place where Hebrew Christians can gather to study Scriptures in a Jewish context and perform the functions involved in various Jewish celebrations (Fruchtenbaum, 1974, p. 97).

In short, the Fellowship, which is essentially the nineteenth century Jewish mission without the aims of the "settlement house" overlaid, provides a virtually total array of religious functions for the Hebrew Christian.

Yet the Fellowship is not intended to be a replacement for membership in a church, even though the Hebrew Christian is meant to feel "at home" there. Thus, Fruchtenbaum (p. 97) instructed that "the fellowship must not be held at the same time as major Church functions", and that "the Hebrew Christian should be a member of the local church along with Gentile believers...But the Jewish culture and identity can be retained through the Hebrew Christian Fellowship" (p. 98).

The proscription of Sunday services that would

"compete" with those of the churches is not surprising coming from an organization dependent on the churches' continued support. Anxious to formally minimize tension with the church community the ABMJ is nevertheless able to provide the Hebrew Christian's unique form of "Jewish culture and identity" through the local Fellowship. A certain contradiction is operant here, to be sure, for what is "politically" necessary to maintain the ABMJ's friendly relationship to the churches (Walker, 1982) ostensibly runs counter to the needs and tendencies of a religious community - so much so, that Fruchtenbaum was compelled to interdict what probably was a common practice.

Conclusion

The road to complete independence for Hebrew Christianity appeared to be barred by its own dependence on the Christian establishment, as well as the movement's unwillingness to become hidden in sectarian obscurity and thereby possibly also lost as the chief evangelizer to the rapidly assimilating, as well as religiously consolidating, Jewish population. For this reason, the Hebrew Christian movement as a whole cannot be placed on the high end of the tension continuum, although independent Hebrew Christian congregations can be so classified, particularly those "without the cognizance of some patron branch of the Church" (IMC, 1927, p. 175). But this pattern of dependence would

significantly change with the transformation of the HCAA into a congregational movement in 1975. The move to a high tension point on the church-sect continuum would be complete.

ENDNOTES FOR CHAPTER THREE

[1]See for examples, the Women's Missionary Society of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, "WayFarers", p. 90; S. B. Rohold, The Jews in Canada (2nd ed.), The Board of Home Missions, Presbyterian Church of Canada, 1913, p. 20. Two of the more interesting present-day examples of this phenomenon are found among the Quakers and the Roman Catholic Church. In the Friends General Conferences Quarterly (Vol. 16, No. 1, Fall 1983), pp. 2, 7 an item reporting a meeting of "Jewish Friends", who "made it clear that they did not share the traditional Christian beliefs about Jesus", and another item being a statement of one "Jewish Friend's" theology, which incorporated the ineffable tetragrammaton YHWH of Jewish tradition to "add depth" to her Quakerism, is not unlike the Hebrew Christian's self-conception. More startling, however, is the article in the New York Times Magazine, March 20, 1983, entitled "A Most Special Cardinal". The Jewish-born Cardinal Lustiger told a reporter the day after his nomination as Archbishop of Paris "I've always considered myself a Jew, even if that's not the opinion of some rabbis ...I was born Jewish and so I remain". Much earlier, when he decided to turn toward Christianity, he told his parents "I'm not passing into the enemy camp. I'm becoming what I am. I'm not stopping being a Jew, just the opposite. I'm discovering a way of living it". (pp. 29, 76; see also 77).

[2]The Zionist movement, perceived as wholly national by some, could theoretically include Hebrew Christians. Reverand J. T. Webster (1917, p. 36) reported that he was sent a pamphlet evidently by a Hebrew Christian from Roumania who made a plea for the acceptance of Christian Jews into the Zionist movement.

[3]This is also the case with the article (later reprinted as a pamphlet) "I am Accused: A Hebrew Christian Refutes the Charges that He has Left Judaism", Shepherd of Israel (ABMJ, Jan., 1962, pp. 1-2), which accuses Jews of forgetting or transgressing the commandments but then concludes that these have been fulfilled in Jesus, the Messiah.

[4]These directives were outlined earlier by Joseph Hoffman Cohn, son of the ABMJ's founder, Leopold Cohn, in the pamphlet "Reaching the Jew in Your Community".

[5]Although Fruchtenbaum did not acknowledge these Talmudic references, see Abraham Millgram, Jewish Worship, Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, (1971), pp. 326-9.

[6]A partial outline is provided by Arnold Fruchtenbaum in the pamphlet "Jewishness and Hebrew Christianity" (n.d., pp. 15-19).

[7]For further documentation of the Hebrew Christian's alienation from the church, see Robert Blumstock, "The Evangelization of Jews: A Study in Interfaith Relations", Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Oregon (1964), pp. 174-79.

[8]"Ontario Conference on Prophecy and Passover Demonstrations" [ABMJ] Calenders, March 4-20, 1983, March 2-18, 1984.

CHAPTER FOUR

Messianic Judaism on the Church-Sect Continuum

The Wake of Hebrew Christianity

Since its nineteenth century origins in England and in the United States, Hebrew Christianity has perdured through a highly organized and polished set of appeals to both the Jewish and the Christian communities. Organizations like the International Board of Jewish Missions, Inc., the ABMJ, the American Association for Jewish Evangelism, the American Messianic Fellowship, the Jews for Jesus, local missions, such as the Buffalo Hebrew Christian Mission, and one-man operations, such as Hillel Goldberg's Friends of Zion, are only a few of the many Jewish missionary organizations, which have programs and publications designed to "educate" the Christian churches and evangelize the Jewish communities at home and abroad.

In so far as Hebrew Christianity hoped to restore the prophesied "remnant of Israel" (Revelations 7:4-8) to the Church, however, its aim remained far from realization. Channelled into the churches, Jewish "believers" did not become the distinct community or the "purifying element" they were intended to be. There are several reasons for this.

The first, and most decisive factor contributing to a weak Hebrew Christian presence in the Church had largely to do with the movement's modest success in converting Jews. Hebrew Christians could not easily convince them to accept the belief, widely held in the movement, that the Jewish people were essentially a racial and an ethnic community, and that, as such, its rabbinic religious traditions were dispensable.

Although Hebrew Christians believed that "Israel" was divinely chosen and set apart as a people, they downplayed Jewish ritual observance, indeed claimed that it was replaced by the doctrines of Christianity. During the formative years of Hebrew Christianity, the separation of the national from the religious aspects of Judaism reflected the nationalistic enthusiasm of many of Europe's Jews, who defined themselves as a separate nation and, with a Biblical (not rabbinic) claim on the land of their origins, looked toward Palestine as their political-national home. By pinning its hopes on the definition of the Jews as "Israel the nation", Hebrew Christianity guaranteed for itself a narrow appeal to the Jews of the Diaspora, to whom "Jewishness" was defined not only as an ethnic community, but, more importantly in the religiously pluralistic western societies, as a religious confession.

The second factor undermining Hebrew Christianity's success at retaining a Hebrew Christian "distinctive" in the

Church is that being relatively small in number, Hebrew Christians' progeny generally lost their Jewish affiliation through intermarriage (Glick, 1958, p. 430). Intermarriage was made all the more probable since Gentiles have always played an important role in the movement (Sobel, 1961) and have numbered among the regular participants in Hebrew Christian fellowships (Sharot, 1968, pp. 37-8). Gentiles have been a strong element at the local level of the Hebrew Christian movement partly because there have been too few Jewish converts to sustain the fellowships and partly because the missionary model of the movement has directed its message to the local Christian community, urging it to appreciate the "Jewish roots of Christianity" and to support Jewish missions. Given the participation and support of Gentile Christians in local Hebrew Christian fellowships, the movement's claim that assimilation and intermarriage were contrary to its aims proved to be untenable.

Closely related to the problems of intermarriage and assimilation, the third factor that prevented the profound impact of Hebrew Christians on the Church was the movement's failure to provide the institutional structure which was necessary to forge them into a recognized religious group. Dependent on churches for support, Hebrew Christian missions and fellowships were bound to act officially as organizations which were secondary to the Church, even though in actuality

they may have been performing a more important function for their members. And although Hebrew Christianity is associated with churches in the Evangelical tradition, the denominational diversity of its members' affiliations further diffused the movement as an identifiable religious community, and was recognized early on as a major source of dissension in the HCAA (1916, p. 15, 40, 41, 43, 44).

Messianic Judaism

In the early 70's a movement formed within the ranks of Hebrew Christianity that would alter the heretofore interdependent relationship it enjoyed for almost a century wih Evangelical Protestant churches. Signalled by a proposal in 1973 to change the name of the Hebrew Christian Alliance of America to the Messianic Jewish Alliance of America, and its adoption in 1975, the new movement, calling itself Messianic Judaism, soon formed a Union of Messianic Jewish Congregations.[1] The latter, now numbering over 80 in the U.S. and Canada,[2] were touted by spokesmen of the Movement as the logical solution to the obscurity, if not extinction, that Hebrew Christians faced in the churches, where they were unable to stave off the erosion of their ethnic and cultural heritage through assimilation and intermarriage. This "solution" and the beliefs and practices of Messianic Judaism would eventually spread to even the staunchest conserves of Hebrew Christianity, such as the ABMJ, while it also would

arouse official condemnations from other organizations both within and without the Hebrew Christian fold.

Why the movement took shape at this particular historical moment can be answered in several ways. Certainly, its rise can be viewed, as Quebedeaux (1978, p. 161) has, as one of the many ramifications of the hippy generation's evangelical awakening, commonly referred to as the Jesus Movement, which swept through America in the late 60's and early 70's.[3] Another reason, offered by the president of the MJAA, David Chernoff, in an interview with the author,[4] and frequently heard throughout the movement, was the rejuvination of Zionist sentiments, aroused during the Arab-Israeli wars of 1967 and 1973 and reinforced by the backlash of popular anti-semitism. One writer noted the impact which the 1967 war had on these Jewish believers in Jesus:

> It is interesting to know that only after June, 1967, did I ever meet Jews who accepted Jesus the Messiah without declaring themselves Christians. Other Jews who have known the Lord for longer periods find themselves moving back into identity with their people and their ancient faith (Abraham, n.d., p. 16).

A third, more direct, reason, which was internal to the movement yet not unrelated to the already mentioned external influences, was the younger generation's interest in their own history. Several M.A. theses by young Hebrew

Christians explored the origins of the movement and focused on the necessity, the theological justification, and the historical precedent for the formation of a "Jewish church".[5]

This internal situation is remarkably similar to that identified by Elizabeth Allo Isichei (1964) in nineteenth century English Quakerism. Isichei (p. 213) discovered that the publication of historical studies of Quakerism both educated and inspired the Quakers during the nineteenth century to retrieve some beliefs and practices from its more fervent period, and essentially reorient the movement from a denominational to a sectarian posture.

If Messianic Judaism is analogous in this respect to Victorian Quakerism, it also differs in so far as it made a formal break with the "parent" movement, not only in name, but also in structure and goals. Moreover, its rise and justification were effected by frequent unbridled attacks on the failures and "dishonest" practices of it predecessor. Indeed, this critique formed the basis of the movement's self-understanding and justified its separation into a full-fledged "Jewish church".

The Elevation of Jewish Religious Life

With the formation of the Union of Messianic Jewish Congregations, the new movement signalled an important change in emphasis from its predecessor: the status and significance of Jewish religious practices were elevated far above the

Hebrew Christian norm. While Hebrew Christianity had asserted the fundamental reality of the national and cultural bond among Jews, it subordinated Jewish ritual observance to a token, almost dispensable role. Messianic Judaism, on the other hand, recognized that the bond among Jewish believers in Jesus could not survive Gentile, let alone secular, incursions without its establishment outside the churches and its reaffirmation in a core of distinctively Jewish religious observances. It therefore made both the establishment of congregations and a cautious return to the Law the principal means whereby it would preserve the Jewish "remnant" - those "144,000 Jews of the tribe of the chidren of Israel (Rev. 7:4-8) [who] are God's Jewish `evangelists' in the Tribulation period" (Klayman, 1982b, p. 5). In doing so, Messianic Judaism treated as problematic what Hebrew Christianity had come to take for granted: the survival of "Jewish distinctiveness" or Jewish culture" (Rowe, n.d., p. 21).

Indeed, it was typical of Hebrew Christians writing on the missionary approach to the Jew, to impute an extraordinary tenacity to the cultural characteristics of the Jews. In an exemplary booklet, Why We Haven't Won the Jew, the author attempted to explicate this missionary conundrum by pointing to "the remarkable features of Jewish culture":

> Its age long development, its harmony and compactness, its unparalleled

> uniformity...The basic features of Jewish culture have persisted through the centuries, relatively untarnished by the interaction of scores of heathen cultures now buried under the dust of ages. Call it immutable if you will. It is nearly that (Rowe, p. 21).

When the author declared: "Obviously, Jewish culture, the complex of forces which set the Jew off as distinct from his fellow man, is here to stay" (Rowe, p. 22), he expressed an optimism that is not shared by the Messianic Movement. On the contrary, leading spokesmen of the movement frequently lament what they see as a fragile Jewish community, imperilled by both assimilationist, specifically secularizing, tendencies from within and anti-semitic forces from without. One member of the movement, lecturing on "Assimilation: How We Confront It", placed the blame squarely on the Jewish community:

> The struggle to survive has been the chief goal of much of Jewish history...In recent times, unfortunately, the Jews' worst enemy has been their own apathy about their spiritual heritage. Scholars within the Jewish community have written numerous articles on the problem of assimilation: the process by which Jews lose their own distinctive Jewishness through intermarriage with Gentiles and in the neglect of their religious observances. The `melting pot' mentality that made [America] what it is today invites acceptance of people into the mainstream of society at the price of giving up their ethnic loyalties...(Fischer, Tape, 1979).

Messianic Judaism's response to this perceived condition of a disappearing community is one of active conservation of Jewish culture in ways that make the provisional efforts of Hebrew Christianity seem, at best insufficient, at worst, insincere. Characterizing Hebrew Christiantiy as merely a "Jewish flavoured Christianity" which was unpopular with the Jews, David Chernoff (Tape, 1982), the president of the MJAA, viewed such efforts to preserve Jewish culture as compromised and ineffective. One spokesman for Messianic Judaism contrasted it to "something that is shallow, that is superficial, that is only a front", making an oblique reference to Hebrew Christianity, which is considered a front for the churches who support its missionary efforts. (In this, the movement, ironically, appears to share the view of the Jewish community).

Indeed, both the missionary goal of wooing Jews into churches and the (often Gentile) missionaries' attempts to cultivate "a shallow Jewish identity" (Finkelstein, Tape, 1982b) are rejected as ploys that ultimately deceive Jews. Referring to `missionary types' who have become involved with the movement (a notable example being Jews for Jesus),[6] Finkelstein (1982b) complained:

> Some people have the idea that Messianic Judaism, we Messianic Jews, are evangelical or charismatic Christians with a Jewish flavour, that we are an arm of the church...[These] people will wear a <u>yarmulka</u> or a Jewish star when it is <u>convenient</u> to

> do so - you know, hand out the little cards with the right terminology and wrong terminology...They will do these as outward things...But when a person will come to the Lord they'll say "well, now you have to join the First Baptist Church. You are a Christian". Woah! I thought I was still a Jew!"

In fact, it is the backlash of Hebrew Christianity's well known missionary approach, including that of one of its more aggressive organizations, Jews for Jesus,[7] that stimulated Messianic Judaism's plea for the "natural" as well as the Biblical basis of its pronounced Jewish religious expression. By pitting itself against such organizations, Messianic Judaism appears to both strike a blow at deceptive practices and place itself apart from the unpopular missionary images that such practices conjure (Wolf, Tape, 1982).

Making a case for its authenticity and honesty, the movement emphasizes its observance of all the Jewish holy days and festivals as well as many traditions, such as wearing the yarmulka, the tallis (prayer shawl), and saying the Kiddush prayer on the Sabbath eve. Some reportedly also wear tzit tzit (a fringed undergarment worn by Orthodox Jews).[8] Unlike Hebrew Christianity's selective use of Jewish holy days as vehicles to convey the gospel to "unbelieving Jews", Messianic Judaism views its observances of holy days and festivals not primarily as missionary devices but as opportunities for Jewish "believers" to be "joyful in their Jewishness", and to transmit this joy to their children

(Finkelstein, Tape, 1982b). Indeed, Finkelstein (Tape, 1982) warned of the consequences of joining a church:

> You will not preserve anything Jewish for your children. You may talk all want about being a lover of Israel but if you sit in a church somewhere where there are no Jewish people around you, as far as your people are concerned, you are the end of the line, you are the last Jew in the family. Your Judaism will not pass down to your children unless you do something about it.

With the Messianic Jewish movement, a notable shift has occurred from the use of Jewish traditions as confirmations of Christianity to their use as affirmations of the religious community of the Jews, and as a means of securing the second generation of Jewish "believers". Consistent with this aim, at least two Messianic Jewish day schools have been established in which Jewish culture and traditions as well as Hebrew are taught.[9] Generally, Messianic Jews argue that the observance of Jewish traditions offers a means whereby they can "remain a part of the larger Jewish community" and "preserve the continuity of [their] culture and heritage" (Klayman, 1982, p. 5).[10]

Doctrinal Foundations of Messianic Judaism

Scriptural injunctions to preserve this religious community are clear to Messianic Jews, as in the case of I Corinthians 17 in which Paul's instruction that the circumcised should not seek to become uncircumcised is

interpreted to mean "Jewish people are expected to keep their Judaism and [themselves] under the law", (Wolf, Tape, 1982) and in the case of Zachariah 8:22, where these eschatological vision of the Gentiles grasping the garments of Jews indicates that the latter will be a nation apart when the messiah rules (Finkelstein, Tape, 1982b). One article on "The Importance of Jewish Identity" (Klayman, 1982b) seeks to show that

> all of the scriptures employed against Jewish believers in Yeshuah [Jesus] for maintaining a Jewish identity [i.e. keeping the Law] dissolve upon careful contextual reading.

Daniel Juster (1977, pp. 9-10), one of the more prolific articulators of Messianic Jewish doctrine, based his view of the separate roles of Jews and Gentiles in the Church on the apostolic council in Acts.

> The council said, in effect, that there could be two wings of the movement of Yeshua - a loyal Jewish wing and a gentile wing. Each group was to consider the other as accepted by God. Neither was to seek to dissolve the other wing into its culture. There could be unity without uniformity; oneness and diversity. Jews were still called to be Jews, but Gentiles were not asked to take upon themselves the whole of Israel's calling as a people.

Agreeing with the dispensationalist view that "there are two chosen people: Israel as a nation and the church as a universal people", Juster argued in an article on "Covenant

Theology" (1977, p. 11) that "there is no reason why one cannot be part of both".

As might have been expected of a movement that consciously aims to preserve "Israel as a nation", Messianic Judaism has witnessed a tentative return of Jewish "believers" to the Law. This limited acceptance of Rabbinic Judaism contrasts sharply to what Sobel (1974, pp. 72-86) judged to be Hebrew Christianity's vilification of post-biblical Judaism as a fraudulent and spiritually hallow creation of the rabbis. Thus did Louis Goldberg, in his article "Which Law?" (1980) argue for a judicious acceptance of the Oral Law (the Talmud) but echoed Rav Moshe Ben Nachman (Nachmanides), a fourteenth century Talmudic commentator, in recognizing the supremacy of the Written Law:

> The Oral Law may be seen as the culture and lifestyle of traditionally minded Jewish people, a culture which is rich in beauty and goodness, especially because it does have a biblical base in a number of areas. But the culture and lifestyle must always be tested and judged by the Scriptures (1980, p. 7).

Barry Budoff, a much younger spokesman for the movement, encourages adherence to the Law but with an appreciation for the role of Grace: [Messianic Jews] are no longer under the law, but under faith. However, we establish the Law through our faith" (1978, p. 10). Instead of feeling obligated to follow the Law, Budoff recommends "follow[ing] the Law out of a sense of love and worship to God" (p. 11).

The return to the Law, though not experienced uniformly throughout the movement,[11] is an indication, not only of a strident declaration of doctrinal "difference" from dominant Christianity, but also of a structural freedom to do so. Since Messianic Judaism does not prepare Jews to become members of churches, it also finds unnecessary the inculcation of the Church's historic polemic against Rabbinic Judaism. On the contrary, Messianic Judaism aims to build an autonomous "Jewish church" in the midst of the Protestant community, and has tapped the vast Rabbinic tradition to enrich its followers' distinctive Jewish character and preserve their "chosen" status.

In drawing upon this tradition,[12] the new movement not only justifies its separate existence from the churches, but also attracts a predominantly Jewish following. In fact, full membership in the Union of Messianic Jewish Congregations requires that

> congregations that apply have at least ten Messianic Jews in their congregation, must have met for a year preceding application, must meet biweekly (endeavouring to have a meeting on Erev Shabbat or Shabbat) and must appoint two members as official representatives of the Union. Those who do not meet these criteria are eligible for "associate membership" - membership without any voting privileges (Rausch, 1982,p. 193).[13]

Apart from these formal criteria, which restrict the charter of congregations to Messianic Jews (the latter

defined as "Jewish person[s] who [have] returned to God by repenting and receiving Messiah Yeshua as [their] own personal atonement"), the introduction of a wide range of Jewish traditions and customs discourages the involvement of Gentile adherents. Consequently, it discourages the high incidence of intermarriage and assimilation that were typical of Hebrew Christianity.

As if to establish finally the exclusive nature of the movement, one of its spokesmen emphasized the Jew's natural inclination toward Jewish life. This inclination is characterized as "a natural outflow of something that is within the kishkas [Yiddish for entrails]...and of being Jewish" (Klayman, Tape, 1982). Another speaker, addressing the still considerable number of Gentiles in the movement - by one estimate, 40 to 60 percent of the congregations' membership (Rausch, 1982, p. 22) - which betrays its Hebrew Christian missionary origins, discouraged them from striving to be Jewish. They were reminded that "it is not a sin to be Christian" (Finkelstein, Tape, 1982). One writer pardoned "those Jews who became in a lesser or greater sense Gentile Christians or Hebrew Christians" before June, 1967 when it was still the "times of the Gentiles" in the Church. "After all", she reminded them "it is not amiss to be a Gentile" (Abraham, n.d., p. 16).

Messianic Judaism's Relationship to the Gentiles and to the Church

Ironically, now that the Messianic Jewish movement is attempting to establish Jewish "believers" as a separate wing of Protestant Christianity, they are witnessing a situation analogous to that which plagued Hebrew Christians in churches. Whereas in the Gentile churches Hebrew Christians were regarded as conspicuous aliens, in the Messianic congregations, which provide an atmosphere for an unselfconscious expression of Jewish traditions, it is Gentiles who are regarded as alien - if they figure in them at all. Thus did one spokesman for the movement envisage the purpose of the Messianic congregation:

> No wonder God has seen fit to raise up Messianic congregations where we can worship as led by the Holy Spirit, fellowship with those who are like-minded, and live a cultural existence that identifies us as we perceive ourselves to be - as Jews (Klayman, 1982b, p. 4).

Because Messianic congregations were formed to counteract the Gentile influence - termed "the enemy" by the president of the MJAA (Chernoff, Tape, 1982) - Gentiles now have to cope with their own cultural and religious inheritance. Like Hebrew Christians in churches, the Gentiles miss some of their traditional holidays, such as Christmas and Easter, feel uncertain about the foreign traditions, and question their status in the congregations vis a vis their Jewish

fellow members (Rausch, 1982b, pp. 928-9).

But an even more serious barrier to acceptance confronts Gentiles in Messianic "synagogues" than faced Hebrew Christians in churches. The Messianic movement discourages intermarriage (Finkelstein, Tape, 1982). In contrast to the universal church, which sought to incorporate Jewish converts into its fold, the Messianic "synagogues" were established, in part to prevent intermarriage and the consequent disappearance of the Jewish nation in the Christian community. In congregations with a sizable Gentile following and a non-Jewish pastor (such as, Melech Israel in Toronto), this has become a particularly delicate problem. At the annual international MJAA conference, which the author attended in 1982, members of such congregations expressed unease, anguish, and even anger at the movement's stand against intermarriage. In particular, Gentile women, who hoped to marry or were involved with Jewish men, expressed shock by the "reverse discrimination". Alex Brummer's (1985) report on Beth Yeshua congregation in Philadelphia, included an item about one of its former members, Cecilia Toth, a woman of partly Gentile background, who left after "the pastor's wife sought to break up her relationship with a Jewish church ["synagogue"] member".

The attitude to Gentile followers in the movement is not uniformly exclusive, however. Their support still has value both for its numerical value and its symbolic link to

Christianity. Rick Coghill addressed the issue of "Non-Jews in a Jewish Congregation" at the 1980 MJAA annual conference, and observed:

> As far as I know - and I think I'm fairly well `in' on every congregation (although there are some started that I'm not familiar with) - every congregation started with a vast majority of Gentiles, and if they haven't started that way, they have at some time or another in their history had - 80 percent would be a common number (Coghill, Tape, 1980).

Commenting on the significance of Gentiles in Messianic congregations, Coghill echoed the Movement's `united but different' interpretation of Galatians 3:28, and recommended against conversion to Judaism. When asked why he, a member of the Messianic singing group, "Lamb", did not convert, he replied:

> It would destroy everything that "Lamb" has sought to build, and that is the balance that we represent. If I had converted to Judaism, there would be no Jews who would be pleased...To the Gentiles in the audience, I'm just some wierd guy who's sold out and gone over to the other side, and of course I'm going to say that I haven't converted, but I'm a Gentile, speaking love to the Jewish people, and love for the nation of Israel, and love for this nation...the Jewish non-believer is that much more impressed (Coghill, Tape, 1980).

Although Coghill concluded with the remarks, "I think we actually maintain the credibility more by having Gentiles that don't convert", and "that's why I'm against conversion

for Messianic synagogues", he nonetheless did not rule it out. Asked whether a non-Jewish partner in a mixed marriage should convert, he answered: "If it's causing disunity...in a specific situation, I would never tell somebody not to" (Coghill, Tape, 1980).

Apparently, the role of Gentiles in Messianic "synagogues" is not entirely circumscribed. On the one hand, a definite trend of Jewish endogamy would appear to spell its demise. On the other hand, the movement's commitment to spreading the gospel to the Jews might benefit from a "legitimate" Christian presence, which the Gentile followers symbolize. In any case, the emergence and consolidation of Messianic Judaism as an independent Christian phenomenon has seen a boldness toward its Gentile adherents that marks the transformation of its reformative interests in the churches that was its inheritance from the Hebrew Christian movement.

While Hebrew Christians were expected to function symbolically in the Church by bringing to it "an aura of antiquity" and by acting as a "living reminder of the original Hebrew Christian foundation of the Church" (Bowler, 1975, pp. 17, 19), Messianic Jews are not necessarily cast into the role of individual "ambassadors" to the Church. Perhaps as much a consequence of the movement's commitment to a Jewish lifestyle, its acknowledgement of the futility of "re-educating" the churches may also be a rationalization of

its commitment to establishing independent congregations. As one speaker put it:

> If you think that you out there can educate the Gentiles in [small town] churches about our holidays and about how to love our people, you can pretty much forget it (Finkelstein, Tape, 1982b).

While the Hebrew Christians' practice of dual membership - to the fellowship and the local church - was especially suited to their role as "ambassadors" to the Church, the Messianic "synagogues" preclude such involvement. Yet the Messianic movement does engage in an "ecumenical" dialogue with churches (and occasionally with synagogues),[14] and views itself as a bridge between Judaism and Christianity. Accordingly, Daniel Juster, a leading spokesman for the movement, attributed "the highly defensive postures" of the church and synagogue to their rejection of the "Nazarene Jews" - the Jewish Christians of the early church.

> The synagogue rejected the gentile image of Yeshua projected by the church, and the church rejected a Jewish view of Yeshua. Through debate and persecution the theologies of both were honed into sharper opposition (Juster, 1977, p. 21).

As the modern-day Nazarenes, Messianic Jews would resolve this misunderstanding.

> A true understanding of Yeshua as a loyal Jew who loved his heritage would be an antidote to anti-Semitism; this understanding is needed by church and

> synagogue. The church would then appreciate Jewish people, never seeking to assimilate them into the larger gentile community. The synagogue could find Yeshua, the true son of Israel and the personal embodiment of the meaning of the Torah. A bridge between church and synagogue can be made without dissolving the distinctiveness of either (Juster, 1977, p. 22).

Needless to say, the Jewish community has been anything but receptive to the Messianic Jews in their midst. Its reaction has included everything from the violent and aggressive tactics of the Jewish Defence League and the Lubavitcher Hassidim, respectively, to scholarly refutations by well known rabbis, such as Mark Tannenbaum.[15] The most common reaction, however, has been avoidance.

Unlike the Jewish community, the Evangelical Christian community has given a favourable sign to Messianic Judaism. Encouraged by its success at bringing Jews to Christ, Dean Arthur F. Glasser of the School of World Mission, Fuller Theological Seminary, endorsed the movement.

> We of the School of World Mission faculty of Fuller Theological Seminary are profoundly grateful for the heritage given to us by the Jewish people and believe that God used the Jewish people as the sole repository of the history-centered disclosure of Himself to mankind...We regret that Christians have unwittingly encouraged new Jewish believers to divest themselves of their Jewish heritage and culture...We encourage Jewish believers in Him to retain their Jewish heritage, culture and marriage customs within the context of a sound

> Biblical theology, Old and New Testament truth (Glasser, 1976, p. 20).

In varying degrees, Messianic congregations have sought to avoid alienating themselves from surrounding churches, especially those in the Evangelical and the Pentecostal traditions in which the leaders were trained. Although Daniel Juster (1980, p. 14) declared that "to me the priority today is the Messianic Congregation", he nonetheless urged fellow Messianic leaders to foster a conciliatory attitude toward the churches.

> We should all seek to learn from one another and be involved with one another; we are one body in the Messiah. A cold shoulder toward the rest of the church is a sure means of hurting the very openness many now have toward us* [*Fuller School of World Missions statement on Jewish believers].

Another leader of a Messianic congregation, John Fischer, founded B'rit Shalom in 1978, which functions both as an educational service agency to Messianic congregations as well and as an educational arm of the movement to the Christian community. In addition, a training institute for future leaders of Messianic congregations was founded, which includes courses offered at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Moody Bible Institute, and Spertus College of Judaica, as well as courses given at the institute (Rausch, 1982a, pp. 196-7).

Making the rounds of area churches is another one of the ways in which a Messianic leader maintains ties to the existing Christian community. The pastor of the congregation, Melech Israel, Toronto, for example, keeps a full schedule of guest speaking engagements with the area churches, more than half being in the Pentecostal tradition (in which the pastor was ordained), followed by Full Gospel and Independent churches.[16] These churches receive a special newsletter, which included a request for donations toward the establishment of planned Messianic congregations.[17]

Despite the ecumenical ideals of Messianic Judaism and the efforts of some of its leaders, the movement and its congregations have aroused criticism and scorn from the church community. An attack published in the Evangelical Baptist (1981, p. 13), accused the movement of committing

> the Galatian heresy of Paul's day, insisting on Christianity-plus. The plus being the traditions and customs of Judaism are added on ...Although they would not admit it, the Messianic Jewish movement is anti-church, choosing its own times and meeting places (often on Friday evenings or Saturday morning) and carrying on many Jewish observances and traditions with "Christian emphasis".

Attesting to the movement's acceptance by some churches, the writer warned against being misled:

> Oddly enough some Christians are really impressed with this, thinking it wonderful that a saved Jew can carry on with his Judaism. Oh foolish Christian, who hath bewitched you?...

> When [Jewish] rituals are employed as a ruse or a device to trick other Jews into believing that they can remain both authentic Jews as well as authentic believing Christians, that is nothing less than deception, which is not worthy of any high religion such as Christianity.

While the Evangelical Baptist does not disapprove of missions to Jews, only of the particular method employed by Messianic Jews, other spokesmen from the church community, who reject the Jewish missionary enterprise altogether, have been provoked by the Messianic movement. Thus, the Reverend L. McCoomb of the Episcopal Church is quoted as saying:

> The current rise of "Jewish Christians'" missionary activity is distressing to both Jews and Christians...because it impugns the integrity of Jewish belief (and) misrepresents Christianity (Blumenfeld, 1982).

One particularly high profile Messianic congregation, Beth Yeshua, with a membership above 200, has brought down the censure of several Christian pastors in the community. They were asked by the Metropolitan Council of Churches in Philadelphia to "prepare a statement expressing their distaste for Beth Yeshua's activities" (Brummer, 1985, p. 5). Among the pastors was David McMillan, described as "an intellectual", who not only thought the notion that "you don't have to convert to be Christian" was deceptive, but also believed, along with many liberal churchmen, that "because of the Holocaust, the Christians have no right to

evangelize the Jew" (Brummer, 1985, p. 5). In a similar vein the Long Island Council of Churches disseminated a letter in response to the Jews for Jesus, "deplor[ing] the pressures which result when any faith group calls into question the right to continued existence of another faith group."[18]

Hebrew Christian Reactions

The separation of Jewish "believers" into Messianic congregations has had a consolidating effect on a large sector of a formerly disparate Hebrew Christian community. The Union of Messianic Jewish Congregations's formal adoption of the National Association of Evangelical's statement of faith, for instance, was motivated by a desire to ensure a shared system of beliefs and protect the Union from "flakey congregations and doctrines" (Rausch, 1982a, p. 195). Yet the move to separate also created division within Hebrew Christianity. Some of the most thorough attacks on Messianic Judaism have come from within the fold, while others eventually gave way to a partial accommodation of the movement's practices.

Among those Hebrew Christians who have denounced Messianic Judaism is William E. Currie, Director of the American Messianic Fellowship. In "Messianic Judaism Examined", Currie (1975) asserted

> To hold before Jewish people that Messianic Judaism is the completion of Judaism is to ignore the clear

> teaching of Scripture distinguishing "Jew, Gentile and the Church of God", (I Cor. 10:32) and the distinctive difference between the future of each. Yet many, obviously sincere in winning Jews to the Saviour, claim there is still another division of Judaism in addition to the Reform, Conservative, and Orthodox Jewish positions; namely Messianic Judaism. This is utterly unscriptural! While still a Jew by birth, in spiritual condition the believing Jew is now a Christian and totally removed from the religion of Judaism.

To Currie, Messianic Jews appeared to be essentially prideful of their "previous position" (as Jews) and were erroneously practising "isolationist policies against the rest of the Body".

Another Jewish missionary organization, the Fellowship of Christian Testimony to the Jews adopted a resolution on October 18, 1975, which rejected Messianic Judaism on the basis of eight points, summarized here as

- its declaration to be a fourth branch of Judaism
- its claim to be a synagogue
- its encouragement of Gentile conversion to Judaism
- its adoption of rabbinic practices
- its isolation from the local church
- its use of Hebrew terms <u>exclusively</u>
- its deceptive and unethical missionary practices.

Believing that "Hebrew Christians should be aligned with the local church", the FCTJ asserted that they should express their "cultural and spiritual gifts" in conformity with New

Testament theology and "in the context of the local church, thus edifying the Body of Christ as a whole and not [acting as] an isolated pseudo-culture" (FCTJ, 1975).

The Superintendent of the Buffalo Hebrew Christian Mission, Inc., Karl Goldberg (1977, pp. 1-3) offered a critique of Messianic Judaism, which closely resembled the statement of the FCTJ. In an article, "Judaizing and Jewish Evangelism", Goldberg acknowledged that

> the new Jewish Christian organizations came into being due to a strong urge on the part of very sincere Jewish believers to identify themselves completely with the Land of Israel, its people, their Jewish heritage and culture. Though there is nothing wrong with this (and to a point I myself do just that), it can only be done within the bounds of Scripture (p. 1).

But he rejected the traditions and the liturgy that have been adopted (and adapted) by Messianic Judaism, on the basis of Galatians 2:16, "faith without law" (p. 2). He also rejected the missionary approach which entailed "couching everything in absolute `Jewishness'". Goldberg (p. 2) cautioned,

> There is nothing wrong in Jewish phraseology. But we must be careful not to use it to the point where it becomes the denial of the Name of Christ.

In a less detailed statement, the American Association of Jewish Evangelism issued a pamphlet "What is Messianic Judaism?", which dismissed the present movement as

un-Biblical. For only

> when Israel has returned to her land and been restored to [a] covenant relationship with God through the acceptance of her Messiah, then and then alone, will Judaism be fulfilled, and the world will see what true Messianic Judaism really is (Zech. 12:10, 14:1-9).

The position taken by the ABMJ and the Jews for Jesus (JFJ) are less clear cut. Both organizations channel Jewish converts into local churches and consequently are dependent on them for support. Characterizing the JFJ, Moishe Rosen, its founder and director, stated "...our Jews for Jesus orientation is more toward the existing standard brand local church..." (1976, p. 17). Once a branch of the ABMJ, the JFJ and the ABMJ severed ties when the latter disapproved of the JFJ's aggressive, even bizarre missionary tactics, as well as its strong emphasis on "Jewishness".[19]

With regard to its emphasis on Jewishness, the JFJ was increasingly aligned with Messianic Judaism, and, in fact, Rosen was on its executive until 1981 (Rausch, 1982b, p. 927). Although it has maintained its structural dependence on the churches, Rosen came to the defence of the Messianic movement when other well-known missions condemned it:

> To me, the Messianic Jewish synagogue (or congregation) is just another version of the local church of which there are so many varieties. It's just that this one happens to have Jewish cultural trappings. No they

> are not anti-Gentile. No they do not preach the Law. No they do not hold a theology that is different from that of other evangelicals. They are trying to show a kosher-type mode of Christianity, preaching that Yeshua the Messiah (Jesus' Hebrew name) is the only way of salvation (Rosen, 1976, pp. 17-18).

The ABMJ was much more circumspect about the Messianic movement than the JFJ, largely because it is a much larger organization, with a long reputation for "low key" missionary "service" to the Evangelical church community. Its expulsion of the JFJ was in keeping with its quite conventional Christian beliefs.[20] In a widely circulated pamphlet, "Should Christians Keep the Sabbath?", for example, Charles L. Feinberg of the ABMJ unequivocally ruled out this Jewish practice as unscriptural.

This stand has been reversed recently, very likely under the influence of the Messiance movement. In an article entitled "Law, Grace and the Jewish Believer", (1984, p. 5), Daniel Goldberg argued that "a day of rest for both Jew and Gentile has never been abolished", with the first day of the week (Sunday) gaining in special significance in the early church. But the historical reasons for this notwithstanding, Goldberg allowed more latitude in the Sabbath observance than did his predecessor:

> in matters of practice, there must be liberty allotted to believers of variant backgrounds, both Jewish and Gentile (p. 5)

Only a year before, however, such freedom was not envisaged by the Canadian head office of the ABMJ. In an interview, Gloria Walker, assistant (and wife) to the director, stated that the introduction of the Law has caused, among other problems, a lot of confusion. Taking Manny Brotmann, an independent Messianic Jewish missionary and congregation leader, as an example of this trend, Walker summarized the problem:

> What his aim is, and this is where we have to be careful, is that he is trying to go back and mix Judaism and the Law with Christianity. They feel they are bridging the gap between the two and so they are making the Jewish person more at home. But we are finding with a lot of these young Hebrew Christians they are getting so mixed up with the Law that they never even believed in nor understood before (Interview, 1982).

While Walker acknowledged Messianic Judaism as another type of Jewish outreach, with essentially the same aims as the ABMJ, she admitted that it was "causing a lot of heartache, not only with the Jewish community but with us - Jewish missions". Indeed, of Manny Brotmann's style of preaching, with yarmulka and prayer shawl, and as a self-proclaimed rabbi, Walker said it is `very, very offensive". "We don't want to get involved in anything like that".

> To be honest with the Jewish community and honest with ourselves, we are a Christian organization. We depend on the Fundamental Evangelical Church for support. Therefore, if a Jew accepts the Messiah we try to steer him into

> an Evangelical church, where he would fit in and feel at home. (Not all will, but still that's another sidetrack on the issue). But he does not change his identity. He's still Jewish. I'm still Irish (Interview, 1982).

This view, while accurately reflecting the formal aims of the ABMJ, its structure, and role in the church community before Messianic Judaism gained ground, is no longer entirely representative. In the April, 1985 edition of the ABMJ missionary magazine, The Chosen People, the lead article, entitled "A Dream Come True", announced the huge success of "Jewish-oriented congregations where Christ is proclaimed from a Jewish perspective and is worshipped by Jews and Gentiles together". Acknowledged as the dream that was envisaged by the ABMJ founder's wife from her deathbed (see p. 50, above), the ABMJ, proudly listed the congregations begun by its missionaries, with its sponsorship, some "until they were able to be self-supporting and self-sustaining" (p. 3).

One missionary, Roy Schwartz, who pastors both the Vinyard congregation in Chicago and the Olive Tree in Toronto, averred

> Its fine to say "there are already enough Bible-teaching churches", but the fact is these churches aren't geared toward concentrated Jewish evangelism (pp. 4-5).

The mid-west regional director of the ABMJ, John Bell, began the first Olive Tree congregation in Chicago, which is now

independent and with its own pastor. Bell's endorsement of the new trend is two-fold:

> Jewish-oriented congregations can serve more effectively than non-Jewish churches on 2 specific levels: (1) They can more readily address the needs of a distinctively Jewish culture, and (2) they can present a corporate testimony of Jesus as the Messiah to large numbers of Jewish people (p. 6).

Bell stated unequivocally that "Judaism is not something from which one should repent". Moreover, "there is a great deal in Judaism, and certainly in the Old Testament, that clearly points to Jesus" (p. 6). Similarly, Larry Feldman, an ABMJ missonary who founded Beth Messiah congregation in East Hanover, New Jersey, stated that

> When unsaved Jewish people enter our services... they can listen to the Gospel without being forced to divorce themselves from anything they've ever known to be a part of themselves and their culture (p. 70.

Conclusion

In establishing what might be termed "Jewish churches", the Messianic movement might be taking the well-trodden path of the ethnic church. Indeed, this was its aim from the start:

> We have black churches to minister to the black community, we have Spanish churches to minister to the Spanish community. In the same way we must have Jewish Messianic Synagogues to

> minister to the Jewish community (Goble, 1975, pp. 8-9).

Given the pluralistic scene in North America today, it is hardly tenable to hold Richard Niebuhr's view of denominaionalism, which regarded as "evil" the sublimation of Christianity's universal ideal to national, racial or economic interests. The reality of denominationalism notwithstanding, the rise of a Jewish church poses a formidable challenge to the pluralistic Christian community. This is so not only because it represents the national and ethnic interests of an historically despised minority group, but also because the movement's model of a Jewish church incorporates many religious traditions of Judaism. The movement may secure a place for itself in the Protestant community as an ethnic church only if it succeeds in silencing the charges that it is resurrecting "the middle wall of partition",[21] and establishing a "fifth branch of Judaism".[22]

If Messianic Judaism is accepted, it is not likely to come from the liberal church tradition. For the movement's success at promoting the survival of Jewish "believers" as a distinct community, has been at the cost of its impercipience of, if not indifference to the conditions in society enabling that survival, namely, the unspoken agreement among the major faiths to be as unintrusive as they are different. Controverting this supreme tenet of American religious

pluralism,[23] the Messianic movement aims to win Jews to Christianity while it claims to possess the fundamentals of Judaism. In addition, the movement finds in the New Testament several convincing reasons to actively reassert the separate, chosen status of the Jewish people - a doctrine that Judaism, particularly Reform and Reconstructionism, has preferred to downplay or reinterpret in exchange for equal status with the dominant Christian traditions.[24]

Observing the American situation, John Murray Cuddihy drew attention to the essentially heretical implications of the doctrine of election.

> The election claim is the claim to be chosen and it is anomolous in the American context - heretical...That the claim to religious election involves the chosenness of a particular ethnic group merely doubles the religio-cultural deviance (Cuddihy, 1978, p. 1Ø6).

Echoing this statement, Sue. E. Levy wrote to the "Letters" column of The Christian Century (Oct. 2Ø, 1982) in response to an article it carried on Messianic Judaism:

> ...if Jews and Christians wish to appreciate and respect the integrity of their neighbour's faith, it is necessary that each of our faith communities remain self assured about those beliefs which define and distinguish us one from the other.

In making Jewish chosenness and exclusivety within the Christian context its principal message, Messianic Judaism has abandoned the caveats of the Hebrew Christian missionary

enterprise, which exhorted cooperation with the churches and cultivated an inoffensive mien in the Protestant and Jewish communities, generally.

The Messianic movement has attempted to foster a friendly relationship with the Christian community - on its own terms. But its conciliatory intentions do not solely determine the outcome. As Johnson (1971, p. 129), Steinberg (1965, p. 118), and Stark and Bainbridge (1980, p. 108) have pointed out, dominant secular values as well as established religious traditions are the norms against which "deviant" religious groups are compared. Messianic Judaism's rediscovery and avowal of Jewish chosenness may be attractive to those second and third generation assimilated Jews who are more comfortable adducing Christian rather than Jewish reasons for upholding their religious inheritance and national identification. But it may also be rejected ultimately by the Protestant community as a transgression of the sacred bounds of religious pluralism if not as the apotheosis of centuries of Jewish obduracy with regard to the Christian message.

The way in which Messianic Judaism copes with these conflicting needs of Jewish recruitment and external pressures of religious acceptance will determine its numerical growth as well as its position on the church-sect continuum. A strong emphasis on the former has placed the movement generally in a position of high tension with the

Christian community. Yet an individual organization's move to a high tension or sectarian posture, in which it is isolated from the church community, is not a foregone conclusion. On a large scale, for example, the ABMJ has given support to, indeed followed the lead of, the Messianic movement in the establishment of Jewish-oriented congregations, but it has not turned away from its evangelical role in the church community nor from its missionary outreach to the Jews.

Another example of a Hebrew Christian mission that has adopted the recent trend toward Jewish-oriented congregations alongside its original commitment to the local church community as a Jewish mission is the Hamilton Friends of Israel. Its ability to maintain a Messianic congregation as well as an evangelical relationship to local churches is largely a consequence of the balancing of leadership functions, which at once serve the needs of its followers and the Christian community. The following chapter will examine the ways in which the Hamilton Friends of Israel has managed its position between the Hebrew Christian and the Messianic Jewish movements.

ENDNOTES FOR CHAPTER FOUR

[1]As of 1982, twenty-five congregations were members of the Union (Rausch, 1982, p. 106).

[2]This figure was given by Brummer (1985), p. 5. If accurate it represents a 100 percent growth in three years. Norman Nelson (Tape, 1982) estimated between 40 to 50 Messianic "synagogues" and Christian Today (Nov. 21, 1980) reported 40 congregations to date.

[3]This essentially reflects the argument in Rausch (1982), pp. 71-83.

[4]Interview during the MJAA annual conference, 1982, Grantham, Pennsylvania.

[5]James A. Hutchens, "A Case for Messianic Judaism", thesis for Dr. of Missiology (1974); Phillip E. Goble "Messianic Judaism: A Biblical Apologetic With a View to Liturgical Reform" (1975), thesis for Dr. of Ministry, both for Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasedena, Calif. Patrice E. Fischer, "The Quest for Jewish Survival in America since 1967 and the Evangelical Community" (1976), thesis for Master of Arts with a major in Mission for Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, Illinois.

[6]While actually in support of Messianic Judaism, the Jews for Jesus are nonetheless geared to channelling converts into churches. See p. 28ff, below.

[7]The confrontation tactics used by the Jews for Jesus, include putting up placards in areas heavily populated by Jews, painting their faces white, putting on street plays and pantomime, and distributing thousands of pamphlets, called "broadsides". The Long Island Council of Churches in 1977 charged Jews for Jesus with "engaging in subterfuge and dishonesty".

[8]Brummer (1985, p. 5) reported "The men wear skullcaps and beards, and some show the fringes associated with orthodox Jews, while the women are clad in pretty frocks, or Israeli costume".

[9]Joseph Finkelstein, "Beit Ha-sefer Ha-adom Ha-katan'/The Little Red Schoolhouse'" American Messianic Jewish Quarterly, 2 (Spring 1979), pp. 17-19; Daniel Juster, "Ets Hayim Day School", American Messianic Jew, 2 (1981), pp. 13-14. See Phillip E. Goble, Everything You Need to Grow a Messianic Yeshiva (Pasedena, Calif: William Carey Library, 1981) and Rausch (1982, pp. 173, 185-6).

[10]See also David Juster, "Jewish Liturgy and Messianic Faith", American Messianic Jewish Quarterly, 4 (Fall 1974), pp. 12-15; "Messianic Jews", Action (1976), pp. 16-24; "A Messianic Jew Pleads his Case" Christianity Today (April, 1981), pp. 22-4; and Louis Goldberg, "Biblical Messianic Jews", American Messianic Jewish Quarterly, (Summer, 1979), pp. 5-11.

[11]Rausch has distinguished between "traditional" Messianic Jews and those with more "liberal" liturgy (1982, pp. 140-1). Those that have gone to the extreme end of Jewish "legalism" seem to have a difficult time holding on to their membership as well as the support of the larger Messianic community.

[12]Rachmiel Frydland is the most frequent contributor of articles on Rabbinic literature to the American Messianic Jewish Quarterly. See bibliography. Frydland together with Elliot Klayman, also publishes The Messianic Outreach, which also focuses on Talmudic writings, as well as modern Jewish literature. In the June, 1982 (Vol. 1, No. 4) issue, Sam Stern wrote, "The present teachings of the rabbis that Messiah has not come, differ from some of the ancient talmudic writings regarding His coming" (p. 5).

[13]Appendix I of the By Laws 1979, "Criteria", p. 4.

[14]"Among his many activities, Juster...holds extensive discussions with rabbis in the Washington, D.C. area, and was invited as a participant in the 1980 dialogue between evangelicals and Jews" (Rausch, 1982b, p. 928).

[15]See Juster's response to Tannenbaum in True Dialogue, (Chicago, Ill.: MJAA), 1977, p. 1. Excommunication has also been used against the Messianic Jews. See "Bitterness of `Messianic Jews' Dispute Intensifies", The Miami Herald, Friday, Oct. 15, 1982, p. 100.

[16]Reverend Hans Vanderwerff, Comfort Ye My People Ministries, monthly news bulletin, for the year 1983.

[17]Comfort Ye My People, August 1, 1983. According to an article in Time, "`Yeshua' is the Messiah" (July 4, 1977,

p. 76), the Messianic "synagogue" Bnai Yeshua, in Stoney Brook, Long Island, "gets backing from such Gentile Pentecostal stalwarts as Christian broadcaster, Pat Robertson and Evangelist, David Wilkerson".

[18]Philip D. Abramowitz, "Jews for Jesus called `Harmful and Deceptive'", The Jewish Week, January 14, 1983, p. 40.

[19]"Jews for Jesus: Under New Management", Christianity Today, September 28, 1973, p. 43.

[20]"The Confession of the Christian Jew", pamphlet, n.d., Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Sar Shalom Publications, ABMJ.

[21]See Juster, "Messianic Jews", Action, 1976, pp. 16-24, and "A New Wall of Partition?", American Messianic Jewish Quarterly, 2 (Spring 1979), pp. 8-10.

[22]David Chernoff, "Messianic Synagogues" (Tape, 1982),and Michael Wolf "Misconceptions of Messianic Judaism" (Tape, 1982).

[23]See Arthur Hertzberg, "America is Different" in The Outbursts that Await Us: Three Essays on Religion and Culture in the United States, Hertzberg, et. al. (New York: Macmillan, 1963), in which he discusses the terms of the American tri-faith consensus.

[24]See Bernard C. Rosen, "Minority Group in Transition: A Study of Adolescent Religious Conviction and Conduct", in The Jews: Social Patterns of an American Group, ed. Marshall Sklare (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1958), pp. 336-46, in which he shows that among Jews who do not believe they are "a chosen people", it is thought to be an undemocratic idea.

CHAPTER FIVE

The Hamilton Friends of Israel: Between Two Movements

The emergence of Messianic Judaism has thrown into high relief the two major goals of the Hebrew Christian movement. On the one hand, Messianic Judaism's commitment to forming a recognizable "Jewish wing of the Body of Christ" in the form of Messianic "synagogues" was presaged by the earliest Hebrew Christian attempts to preserve the Jewish remnant in the Church through the establishment of associations, fellowships, and congregations. On the other hand, the new movement's rejection of the church-sponsored mission structure, and its transformation of "mission" to "passive testimony" contrasts to the active missionary mandate that was and continues to be the raison d'etre of many Hebrew Christian missions.

It might be predicted that the two goals of preserving a community of Jewish "believers" and recruiting converts would polarize, casting the Messianic "synagogues" and the Hebrew Christian missions in opposing and exclusive camps. To some extent, this has occurred. The American Messianic Fellowship, the American Association for Jewish Evangelism, the Fellowship of Christian Testimony to the

Jews, and the Buffalo Hebrew Christian Mission opted for the maintenance of "low tension" relations with the churches, and censured the practices of Messianic Judaism as separatist and tending to competitive and therefore "high tension" relations with the churches. Yet the polarization of the two goals and their structural consequences are not inevitable, as is apparent in the example of the American Board of Missions to the Jews, which chose to maintain its mission structure while sponsoring the establishment of Jewish-oriented congregations, and appointing its missionaries as their "spiritual leaders".

Up to now, we have viewed Hebrew Christianity and Messianic Judaism in relative states of tension with the Protestant church community in which they claimed membership. Given the multiplicity of missions and congregations, which comprise the movements, varying levels of tension are anticipated on an individual level. Although such a variety is conceivable and explainable within the confines of the Stark and Bainbridge church-sect continuum, an individual organization's attempts to "manage" its tension with the environment through the employment of leadership strategies are not.

This chapter will attempt to fill this lacuna. It will focus on one Hebrew Christian mission, the Hamilton Friends of Israel.[1] Similar to the ABMJ but on a much

reduced scale, the HFOI spawned and continues to maintain a Messianic congregation alongside its mission fellowship. How the HFOI has been able to accommodate a Messianic congregation without a consequent schism is due to the different audiences and goals which the fellowship and congregation have come to serve. But it is also due to the special skills as well as the symbolic value of its Jewish leader. For if the Hebrew Christian movement urged its missionaries to cultivate cordial and cooperative ties with the local churches, it also was deeply aware of the unique position which its Jewish missionaries occupied in the Gentile Christian community.

Social Movement Propositions and Religious Groups

The study of social movement organizations has generated propositions which are useful for the analysis of religious groups.[2] Zald and Ash (1966, p. 329), for example, have included "proselytizing and usually messianic groups" under the social movement organization rubric because groups of this kind attempt to dynamically transform society or individuals. Having specific goals, these groups are subject to obvious signs of success or failure, which Zald and Ash have argued result in certain predictable transformations of goals and tactics. One important area of change involves leadership, and Zald and Ash have connected the attainment of

organizational goals and their transformation to the dual functions of leadership outlined by Gusfield (1966).

The Dual Leadership Functions

The leader's role in a social movement organization has been identified as a pragmatic application of tasks in response to the perceived needs of an organization. According to this view, articulated by Gusfield (1966) and others,[3] a leader must cater to the demands of both the external and the internal environments in order to promote an organization's optimum chances of survival. On the one hand, the demands of the external environment entail the leader's exercise of his articulation function in order to gain recognition, legitimacy, and financial support - a process McCarthy and Zald (1977, p. 1221) have called "turning adherents into constituents". On the other hand, the demands of the internal environment require the leader's mobilization of his follower's commitment to and participation in a unique set of beliefs and goals.

The works of Gusfield (1966) and Zald and Ash (1966) not only argue that a moderate fulfillment of both leadership functions is the most common occurrence, but they also suggest that it is a condition for organizational longevity. While Gusfield (1966, p. 154) views the single leader who juggles both the tasks of articulation and mobilization as mediocre,[4] and "the expected and not the unusual occurrence",

Zald and Ash (1966, p. 339) state that the simultaneous fulfillment of leadership functions is characteristic of certain "stages" of an organization's survival. They do not identify the stages, but one of them might be the stage of the "becalmed" organization. It is in a becalmed organization, characterized neither by success nor failure (Zald and Ash, 1966, p.334), yet comfortably entrenched in the social system, that "the officials gain a vested interest in maintaining their positions and in having a stable, non-conflictual relation to the society" (p. 332). Hence, the value of a leader who maintains his roles as both articulator to the community and as mobilizer of a small group of movement representatives.

Sources of Strain in Leadership

There are, however, sources of strain that can contribute to the breakdown of this apparently stable relationship. In addition to a shortage of manpower that requires a single individual to perform the dual functions of leadership in a becalmed organization, these functions themselves have been viewed as contradictory efforts. For mobilization emphasizes ideological uniqueness, while articulation requires a diluted message and the tactics of compromise (Zald and Ash, 1966, p. 339). In fact, the accommodationist or watered-down message of the becalmed

organization may provoke a radical stand among some of its followers, resulting either in separate organizational entities or in the inclusion of factions in the organization.

While Zald and Ash anticipated the rise of factions in becalmed, inclusive organizations that generally have loose doctrinal and membership requirements, they did not foresee the simultaneous leadership of a group and its faction by a single individual. Presumably, the ideological dilemma of both an external and an internal audience is further complicated by the rise of a faction whose comparatively radical stand undermines the balancing of the leadership functions and the unified image of the organization. In such a case, the leader's continued exercise of articulation is not likely to convince his supporters in the community that his goals are other than inconsistent - unless, of course, he has the uncanny ability to convey to his audience that his diverse efforts are all part of an overriding ideal. His impact, however, may issue from more than his oratorical or rhetorical skills. Indeed, the leader's possession of a special status, which represents the ultimate goals of the organization, will significantly affect his being recognized as its uniquely qualified leader and, therefore, the extent to which he will successfully minister to different audiences through the dual leadership functions.[5]

Identifying the leader's expressive, symbolic value enlarges upon the leadership functions identified by Gusfield and links their fulfillment to organizational goals discussed by Zald and Ash. Not only is the connection between leadership and organization thereby elaborated, but the ability to predict the likelihood of a leader's success in undertaking the articulation and mobilization functions of diverse audiences is also advanced. This view is based, therefore, on the fundamentally interactive, rather than "unidirectional" (Worsley, 1968, p. xviii) role of the religious or social organizational leader.

The Case of the Hamilton Friends of Israel

The case of the HFOI fits many of the propositions made by Zald and Ash, and shows the pivotal role of the leader in the maintenance of an organization that has spawned and retained a radical faction. It also reveals, what Ralph D. Winter (1980) has recognized as the "uneasy tension" between the missionary society's "para-church" function and the established denominations. For if the HFOI is a good example of leadership dexterity, it is also an example of the pragmatic relationship between a voluntary mission society, which acts virtually autonomously but depends on the churches for support, and the churches, which are "directly responsible for only [their] internal life and discipline and depend[...] upon external voluntary societies as [their] arms

and legs in social and missionary activism" (Winter, 1980, p. 204).

An Organization Becalmed

Founded as the Mission for New Canadians in 1892, the HFOI evolved into an independent Canadian mission to Jews (Mackay, 1978, p. 7). Its early missionary efforts, which included teaching English to Jews, home visiting, and public proselytizing, continued "despite much opposition" (Mackay, 1978, p. 25). Although it never established formal ties with such leading Hebrew Christian organizations as the ABMJ and the HCAA, its early cultivation of a love for Israel and the Jews, its evangelical commitment "to the Jew first...", as well as its promotion of pamphlets and publications by prominent Hebrew Christian spokesmen located it ideologically within the Hebrew Christian movement.

The HFOI did not attract many Jews to its ranks. As early as 1933, the year of its incorporation (Mackay, 1978, p. 14), the HFOI appears to have held its Weekly Praise and Prayer Fellowship meetings for the benefit of the Gentile participants, who far outnumbered the Jews (Mackay, 1978, pp. 9, 17). Indeed, the history of the organization, as recounted by the leader of over 40 years, betrays no Hebrew Christians among its missionaries, although "often a Hebrew Christian speaker was invited" (Mackay, 1978, p. 23, see 82-

9). Its limited success notwithstanding, the HFOI became firmly entrenched in the Christian, largely evangelical, community[6] as a mission to Jews, and it has persisted even though direct proselytization of Jews has been all but given up.

This did not change even with the advent of the HFOI's first Hebrew Christian pastor in 1973. A relatively new follower of the mission, he and his Gentile wife were solicited for the leadership position because their strong interest in both Israel and Jewish missions, as well as the pastor's rapport with Jewish people, coincided with the missionary and evangelical goals of the organization. No small factor attending the decision, however, was the Directorate's failure for the past seven years to find among its mainly single women followers a replacement for the couple who had headed the HFOI since 1933 (Mackay, 1978, p. 78; Lemond, 1978, p. 89).

By the new couple's formal accession to leadership on January 1, 1974, the organization was clearly in a becalmed stage, retaining both a support base in the church community and a core group of followers of the Weekly Praise and Prayer Fellowship, virtually all of them Gentile. The latter numbered approximately 30, while its supporters in the community amounted to about half of the 750 recipients of the monthly newsletter (Interview, Nov. 18, 1981).

From Active to Passive Evangelization of the Jews

To the leader the initial missionary zeal of the HFOI represents another era when revivals were regularly staged in the city (Mackay, 1978, p. 66), missionaries were naively bold, and immigrant Jews were grateful recipients of charity and attention from their host population. The leader recalled

> Our organization reaches back to the days when the Jews were immigrants who had nothing. And [the] missionaries, I believe, were led by the Lord to help these new immigrants. They had Bible classes, they went to their homes, and brought them gifts, and in their enthusiasm, they wanted to give them what they had, Jesus (Interview, Nov. 18, 1981).

If this is an innocent portrayal of the early missionary efforts, one thing is certain, modern day missions cannot be viewed as such. For journals such as Missiology and organizations like the World Council of Churches attest to the fact that missionary activity is subjected to constant social and theological self-scrutiny. In the case of the Jews, especially, it is regarded as an arrogant and destructive, if not futile, enterprise.[7]

The leader of the HFOI is all too aware of the difficulty of penetrating the Jewish community with the Gospel. Unlike its nineteenth century predecessor, the middle- and upper-class Jewish community that established itself in the city after the Second World War had its own

institutions to turn to and was not in need of Christian charity. The leader has learned from his own attempts to make inroads that even low-key forms of evangelization meet with resistance and harrassment from the Jewish community. His storefront, which is decorated with a large Star of David in blue and white, Israel's national colours, posters of the Holy Land, and books on Hebrew Christian theology, has been the target of repeated attacks by vandals.[8] His book table on the campus of the local university prompted a number of Jewish students to pressure him to leave, and his sponsorship of a Messianic singing group brought about a small but persistent demonstration at a performance (Interview, Dec. 2, 1981). As a result, he has taken a passive approach to Jewish evangelization, responding to those who come to his storefront organization rather than seeking them out. Indeed, he views aggressive missions to Jews, like Jews for Jesus, as futile:

> It doesn't work in conservative Canadian surroundings...In each and every way [missionaries] bring souls for Jesus Christ, and that's alright with me. But we don't do that here (Interview, Jan. 6, 1982).

Generally speaking, the leader's relationship to the Jewish community is marked by restraint. He admitted that

> I like to go to synagogues occasionally. It gives me some kind of an inner joy and satisfaction to see my roots, where I come from (Interview, Dec. 16, 1981).

On a few occasions he has attempted to make contact with the local rabbis. One of these encounters, at an `old world' orthodox synagogue, was somewhat awkward. Several of the men in attendance were from Hungary, as is the pastor, and soon he was asked to go up to the Torah and hold it up as the mantel was placed over it. Having discovered afterwards that the visitor was baptized, the Rabbi indicated that he could not have the same privileges as the others. This incident recalled by a member who was present, was apparently made more awkward by the pastor's wife, who cried out "Hallelujah" from the hushed women's gallery.

The HFOI's Mission to the Christian Community

While for the most part, a self-conscious silence characterizes the leader's relationship to the Jewish community, the same cannot be said of his relationship to the Christian community. In fact, it is not an overstatement to say that the latter constitutes the primary object of the leader's missionary activity. The HFOI's original goal of converting individual Jews has been overshadowed by a broad goal of bringing about a reformation in the Gentiles' attitude toward Jewish people and Israel. This reflects in part the personal proclivities of the leader, who, when asked to identify and rank his goals, placed "instilling Christian Zionism" in the Gentiles significantly above "missions to

Jews" (Interview, Jan. 6, 1982). In fact, the conversion of the Jews is pushed farther away from the present, either being contingent upon a "re-education" of the Gentiles, or envisaged as an apocalyptic event:

> In my vision, we are in a stage of sowing the seed for the future when, in my view, there will be a mass of Jewish people who will convert to the messiah...The time hasn't come yet (Interview, Nov. 18, 1981).

Whatever the leader's personal vision, the transition from a conversionist goal, whose attainment is indicated by the number of converts, to a broader evangelical goal, whose success is measured by symbolic and financial gestures of support, has not only renewed the organization's missionary purpose but also rendered the leader's efforts less susceptible to public scrutiny and failure. In this, the HFOI's missionary tactics resemble those practised by the ABMJ (Blumstock, 1968, pp. 30-1). Unable to procure, for several years, a Hebrew Christian missionary who would operate exclusively in Canada, the Canadian head office of the ABMJ has worked primarily on arranging visits of its American "field evangelists" to the local evangelical churches (Interview, Walker, Jan. 28, 1982). The change, therefore, in the HFOI's missionary aims and target audiences reflects an adaptive trend already established in the Hebrew Christian movement by its leading organization, the ABMJ (see Zald and Ash, 1966, p. 333).

Because the HFOI, like the ABMJ, is dependent on the evangelical church community for both is financial support (Interview, leader, Nov. 18, 1981) and its active followers, the leader must be skilled in the articulation of Hebrew Christian beliefs to a heterogeneous church audience. Since his incumbency, the leader has promulgated his message in a variety of denominations, established sects, and prayer groups in the local community. His work entails preaching about the Jews and Israel in prophecy, teaching Sunday schools and adult study groups, giving testimony about himself and his work, speaking on panel discussions, showing slides of Israel, lecturing on its present state of affairs, and demonstrating selected Jewish traditions, such as the Passover seder. He has also hosted a weekly half-four radio spot on the local university radio station and has appeared on an evening religious television programme, which features interviews with fundamentalist Christian personalities.

Functioning as a kind of "ambassador" (Gusfield, 1966, p. 142) for the HFOI, the leader aims to combat anti-semitism and anti-Zionism in the churches, while he hopes to maintain as well as attract new constituents with his effective table display of the HFOI newsletter and Hebrew Christian literature, which includes his biography by Barbara Lemond (1978). As he put it:

> We want to inject into the church the interest in the land of Israel as God's land. And the other thing is to

> combat through information, anti-semitism (Interview, Nov. 18, 1981).

One follower described the role of the HFOI as

> ...the vehicle to bring [doctrinal] stability back to the Evangelical community [by acting] as a bridge between Evangelical Christianity and Judaism (Interview, Jan. 26, 1982).

The Weekly Praise and Prayer Fellowship

While the leader's articulation function best serves his attempts to gain legitimacy and support from the church community, his desire to groom individuals as future "ambassadors" for Hebrew Christian beliefs requires his exercise of the mobilization function. The latter is carried out in the HFOI's Weekly Praise and Prayer Fellowship where the approximately 30 people who attend learn about Christianity's indebtedness to Biblical Judaism and the present world's dependency on Israel. The leader explained:

> What I'm pushing, is a love and concern for Israel, and the prophetic aspect of the Bible regarding Israel and the Jewish people (Interview, Jan. 13, 1982).

To this end, the leader incorporates occasional Hebrew words in the service, refers to Jesus at times by his Hebrew name, "Yeshuah", and emphasizes the prophetic passages in the Bible concerning Israel. The fellowship room, decorated with Jewish symbols and Israeli artifacts, is in itself a reminder to all those present of the HFOI's mission.

An oversized, gold painted menorah with large multi-coloured candlesticks sits on the piano, a spray of souvenir Israeli flags is tacked on the wall, small Stars of David are perched on the wall lamps, picture books, posters, and maps of Israel are displayed on the back wall and table, prints of Chagall's "Jerusalem Windows" adorn the hallway, a large Israeli flag is draped behind the dais, and a plaque inscribed with the HFOI's motto: "Pray for the peace of Jerusalem" is hung on the side wall.

In this Jewish "atmosphere" the service proceeds in a fairly free flowing manner, with little rigid structure apparent. The "gifts of the spirit" are evident in spontaneous prayer, faith healing, and, occasionally, speaking in tongues. The service also includes a repetoire of songs which have increasingly replaced many from the standard Protestant hymnal. They are made up primarily of scriptural passages set to music as well as a few Hebrew and Hebrew-English songs. Bible study is an important ingredient, as are personal testimonials that attest to the "holy spirit" working in the lives of the daily members or in the hearts of would-be converts.

On certain occasions, the group's appreciation of the Jewish tradition is heightened by the celebration of Jewish festivals to which both Jews and Gentiles are invited. While the festivals are valued as opportunities to witness to "unbelieving" Jewish people by showing them "how the

particular feast points to the messiahship of Christ",[9] very few if any Jewish people are actually present at them. At the HFOI party to celebrate Hannukha (the Jewish Festival of Lights) in December 1979, for example, the only Jewish people present were an immigrant Egyptian Jewish family who, preoccupied with their young children, seemed indifferent to the activities around them. In addition, an elderly Jewish friend of the pastor, who was not a "believer" herself, had agreed to come and sing some Yiddish songs. When she broke out into a semi-operatic "Granada" it was apparent that she was inclined to sing more for the sake of entertainment than to hallow the religious event.

At times like this, when the hope of proselytizing Jews rapidly fades, the other function of the celebration takes on primacy. It is the teaching of Gentiles about Judaism, both religiously and culturally - not least of which involves cultivating an appreciation for the traditional Jewish foods. Of course, religious and cultural knowledge of Judaism ostensibly serves the HFOI's missionary aims to the Jews, since the followers are expected to be able to witness to Jews, and success in this undertaking depends on convincing the Jews that true Christianity is "very Jewish, in fact...is permeated with Jewishness" (ABMJ, 1977, p. 33).

Some of the followers explained the importance of the HFOI: in general and in their lives:

> We get to see films on Israel like "Apples of Gold". We want the Jewish people to know how much God loves them and keeps His promises to them. (Questionnaire Jan. 1984).
>
> I believe the Lord is vitally interested in the Jews and their knowledge of Messiah, especially today [and] also in Christians appreciating their Jewish heritage. (Questionnaire Jan. 1984).
>
> The greatest concern [of the HFOI is to] pray for the peace of Jerusalem, for the salvation of God's chosen people. (Questionnaire, Jan. 1984).
>
> [The thing that most attracts me to the HFOI is] the emphasis on Israel and the Jewish people as God's Chosen people. God has a definite plan concerning Israel. [I appreciate] the fellowship with like believers and those with a mutual interest in Israel. (Questionnaire, Jan. 1984).
>
> We learn a lot about the Old Testament and we sing and worship God with the psalms, and we all pray for the Jewish people and love them. Israel is the most important nation in the world ...I want the Jewish people to know that we understand more of what they have gone through. There is only one true Christian, and that is the one who loves the Jewish people. (Questionnaire, Jan. 1984).
>
> Anti-semitism is strong amongst Gentiles, and even Christian churches. The HFOI is unique in that we truly love God's Chosen People - the Jews - and God's Chosen Land - Israel. (Questionnaire, Jan. 1984).

The leader's efforts to cultivate in the Gentile a sympathetic appreciation for Israel, the Jewish people, and Jewish traditions finds its most profound expression in the

group's excursions to Israel. Twice a year[10] the pastor and his wife organize and chaperone members of the group and others on a trip to Israel. Many consider this the high point of their religious experience and commitment, the latter indicated by the considerable financial burden which the predominantly working-class members assume. Even so, out of twenty-two followers who were asked whether they had travelled to Israel, twelve had, some more than once. (Questionnaire, Jan. 1984).

While the members who went to Israel spoke profoundly about the renewal of faith and the spiritual lift that resulted from the experience, the trip's purpose was not strictly to bring about the members' spiritual regeneration. Several weeks prior to the spring trip, the pastor and his wife enjoined the members, even those who were staying at home, to purchase as many missionary booklets destined for distribution in Israel, as they could afford. The pastor's wife remarked that the booklets' colour photographs of Israel were bound to attract the attention of the Jews there. Not all collections are for missionary purposes, however, and on each trip the HFOI purchases and plants several "trees for Israel". The organization also donates money to the Jewish National Fund and Boystown (Interview, Dec. 10, 1981).

In all, the Weekly Praise and Prayer Fellowship lives up to the HFOI's name. They are a group of people who are

marked by a keen interest in Israel and the Jewish people. Although the hope that the Jews will discover "their" messiah is expressed, it is by and large the followers who rediscover their "Jewish" messiah. And it is this discovery which binds together the diverse adherents.

For as an inclusive group, the Weekly Praise and Prayer Fellowship reflects the heterogeneous audience to which the leader articulates his message in the community. Indeed, the followers are expected to retain membership in their "home" churches, a sampling of which includes: The West Hamilton Gospel Church, the New Covenant Fellowship, the Faith Christian Centre, the Brethren in Christ, the German Baptist Mission, and the United Church. Practising dual membership enables them to counsel against anti-semitism and anti-Zionism to their fellow congregants by witnessing about the Jewish "roots" of Christianity and the importance of Israel in prophecy. In addition to gaining constituents (Kohn, 1983), the members thereby contribute to the leader's role as articulator of a message that is intended to be influential outside the group.

In a similar way, the diversity of the HFOI board of directors' church affiliations - four Fellowship Baptists, two Pentecostals, one Christian Reform - (Interview, Mar. 3) not only symbolizes the interdenominational character of the mission, but also "links it with various constituencies" (McCarthy and Zald, 1980, p. 12) and ensures it a legitimate

status in the church community. As Harrison and Maniha (1978, p. 217) have pointed out, "the moral resource of legitimacy...facilitates access to other more tangible resources". Thus, the inclusive Weekly Praise and Prayer Fellowship is compatible with both the leader's articulation function and his aims to change the churches because it promotes his interorganizational affiliations and his access to tangible resources (Zald and Ash, 1966, p. 339).

The Rise of an Exclusive Faction

Despite the stability of an inclusive group, its heterogeneous membership and minimal success in attaining its goals may cause it to rely increasingly on "solidary incentives [which eventually] act to separate the organization into homogeneous subgroups [along the lines of] ethnic[ity], class, and generation" (Zald and Ash, 1966, p. 337). Both factors appear to have played a role in the HFOI, which began an exclusive Sunday service in October, 1980. While the Weekly Praise and Prayer Fellowship, which was instituted back in 1921 (Mackay, 1978, p. 18), continued to serve its elderly members, who were satisfied with the modest aims of the conventional Hebrew Christian mission, it did not meet the needs of four young families, who were disappointed in the local churches and were searching for an alternative Sunday service. With the help and participation of these

young people, the leader started a family-oriented Sunday service and Sunday school. In less than a year, approximately 20 parents and 15 children attended the service on a regular basis.

A Messianic Congregation

While the family-oriented character of the Sunday group reflects the participants' solidary needs, the style of worship emulates that of Messianic Judaism. In addition to the leader's frequent visits to a growing Messianic congregation in a neighbouring city, the involvement of several young people in the HFOI, formerly associated or affiliated with that congregation, and their search for a similar one in Hamilton, influenced the direction of the HFOI Sunday service. One couple explained their attraction to the Messianic worship style as stemming from a "burden", "love", and "need" for the Jewish people, and from their desire "to be part of the promises to the Jewish people mentioned in Zachariah 8:23 and 2:8" (Testimony, Feb. 18, 1982). A young woman, who had been attending the Messianic congregation in Toronto as well as the HFOI, complained that the latter was "not Jewish enough".[11]

This was to change however as the Sunday group gradually took on more of the Messianic worship style. One former minister, who had been asked by the leader of the HFOI to consider replacing him explained why he did not feel

adequate to the job.

> There were difficulties in accepting the position here...One key difficulty was that I wasn't Jewish, myself. I felt that that was important, because I have different ideas for this mission, and [the leader] does too...[The old HFOI missionary] approach is changing in the mission here. And I realized that we were going to go more into the Jewish culture, the Jewish style of worship - something that I was just totally unfamiliar with (Interview, Feb. 10, 1982).

As the Messianic movement gained momentum, and Gentile "Messianists" became accepted (particularly in the Toronto congregation, which had more Gentiles than Jewish adherents), the reservations voiced by the young minister gave way to a desire to learn Hebrew songs and blessings. While his involvement lasted only a few months, others enthusiastically learned the new worship style. At services they intoned the most sacred Hebrew prayer, the Shema, some wore yarmulkas, and one member with a Jewish background was conspicuous in his prayer shawl. The service incorporated much from Messianic liturgy, including the reading and expounding of the weekly Torah portion, which is read in all synagogues, and is followed before and after with blessings in Hebrew. A distinctively Messianic element is the emphasis on Hebrew songs and Israeli dancing. In the style of "Kol Simcha", a group operating out of the Messianic Jewish Alliance of America, several young women performed Israeli

style dancing not only for the congregation, but also, on occasion, for the churches at which their leader was a guest speaker.

By establishing the Messianic congregation, the leader not only responded to the internal needs of the group, but also the external trends in the Messianic movement, which gave the Sunday worship its distinctive content. "By and large, Messianists do not view themselves as missionaries" (Hutchens, 1977, p. 288), but as an alternative Christian worship, which they believe faithfully reflects the practices of the "Jewish" apostolic church.[12] As expected, many of the adherents do not hold membership in "home" churches. Unlike the followers of the Thursday night Fellowship, who all claim some other religious affiliation, seven claim no other affiliation, while four others attend another church once a month, once in a while, or not at all (Questionnaire, Jan. 1984).

The Reaction of the Churches

With the advent of an exclusive, Messianic group, the leader of the HFOI incorporated a new set of goals and tactics alongside those dedicated to the re-education of the churches and the training of individual "ambassadors" for the HFOI. His commitment to different audiences and divergent purposes would seem to require not only the practical

division of energies, but also the delicate balance of divided loyalties. Yet his celebration of Jewish holy days, his use of Jewish liturgical prayers, songs and rituals, as well as his attempt to introduce the monthly observance of the eve-of-the-Sabbath service, widens the doctrinal differences between himself and the churches. One minister, who was particularly interested in Jewish missions and personally drawn to Judaism and the Jewish origins of Christianity, nevertheless was wary of the Jewish worship style, which introduced "the danger of adding the Law to the Gospel" (Interview, Apr. 28, 1983). Other ministers, though admittedly differing theologically from the HFOI (Interviews, Ar. 28, 28, May 4, 6, 1983), were tolerant of the Jewish worship style as a necessary, if not inescapable, expression of Jewish "believers" - apparently unaware of their paucity in the organization.[13]

Added to the doctrinal differences, the leader's mobilization of a Messianic service in an exclusive group erodes its image in the church community as a mission to the Jews. While some ministers were content to view the HFOI, in agreement with the leader's own perception (Interview, Nov. 18, 1981), as a "para-church" or as a "non-proselytizing mission" (Interviews, Apr. 26, May 4, 1983), other ministers were given to thinking that the HFOI had reneged on its missionary mandate. Consequently, the leader was put on the defensive:

> It is not an aggressive ministry. But this sometimes brings us into conflict with the churches. Some people have ideas that border on fanatacism, and they ask, "how many Jews did you convert? (Interview, Nov. 18, 1981).

This traditional aim of the Jewish mission was echoed by a local minister, who was otherwise well disposed toward the HFOI: "There should not be a segregation of Jewish believers", rather an inflow of converts into the churches, bringing with them their Biblical knowledge and Jewish heritage (Interview, Apr. 28, 1983).

The generally tolerant, though varied, attitudes of the church leaders notwithstanding, the leader explained that he was not free to organize as a fully-fledged Messianic congregation:

> I can't! - because our work is supported by Gentile Christians...I could make a wrong move and the whole thing could collapse (Interview, Nov. 25, 1981).

The Leader's Symbolic Value

The fact remains, nonetheless, that the leader of the HFOI has been able to skillfully continue his role as articulator to the churches even while mobilizing an exclusive group whose purpose seems to undermine the organization's stated missionary aim, "to make the Good News known to the Jewish people". For the HFOI's constitution "has not been redefined officially" since the organization's

early days" (Interview, leader, Nov. 18, 1981). It is likely that his successful fulfillment of both leadership functions is due in great measure to his important symbolic value as a "born Jew", who has become a "born again" Christian (see Gusfield, 1966, p. 141). According to a random sample of five local ministers, who knew the leader of the HFOI, "his Jewish background enhances the appeal of his message", while his Christian belief is a symbol of the organization's historic commitment to Jewish missions and a testimony to its success. His biographical account of persecution by the Nazis as a young Hebrew Christian gives him the added, if ironic, distinction as both a Jewish and a Christian Holocaust survivor, and consequently makes him an authority on the evils of anti-semitism.

Indeed, his dual identity, which formerly made him feel like "a bird in a cage" especially when he was identified in his church as a "Jewish deacon" (Interview, Nov. 25, 1981) now is an effective symbol through which he both expresses the harmony of Jewish and Christian traditions and re-educates the Gentiles about the importance of the Jews and Israel in prophecy. Ministers in the community viewed him as "the uniquely qualified leader", possessing "authenticity", "deep conviction", and "a special affinity to the Jews" (Interviews, Apr. 26, May 4, 6, 1983). Thus, one minister concluded

> His very experience as a `fulfilled Jew' demonstrates [the] very possibility [of conversion], in spite of all the obstacles that attend that kind of decision (Interview, Apr. 26, 1982).

Another minister compared his significance to that of a Black leader in a civil rights movement (Interview, May 4, 1983).

To his Gentile Messianic group, the leader of the HFOI is a personification of the Jewishness of the apostolic church in Jesus' time, and is a living example of a viable Christian alternative for Jewish people. A particularly articulate follower, who is a serious, self-taught Bible student, commented on the leader's ability to "restore the true teaching of Christ", noting "that the element of Christ's ministry [the "Father-nature" of God] would be more obvious to someone of Jewish background". Indeed, he averred that Jewish "believers", generally, "would have a Father-consciousness that would be more allied with scripture" (Interview, Jan. 26, 1982).

The importance of Jewish leaders in Messianic groups was especially evident at the 1982 international MJAA conference where almost all of the congregation leaders were Jewish, though many of the followers were Gentile. Another observer of a Messianic congregation or "Jewish church" (Guttwirth, 1982) also noted the disproportionately high number of Jewish leaders in a church and its satellite "house churches" which were committed to bringing Jews into the fold

but whose Jewish membership amounted to only six percent. He argued that the presence of Jewish leaders and the shifting of Jewish members to other churches with strictly Gentile congregations were motivated by an awareness of the symbolic value of Jews, insofar as they represented the successful middle class, whose ranks the members were socialized to join (Guttwirth, 1982, p. 53).

In the example of the HFOI, a different message is conveyed by the presence of a Jewish leader. It is not his social class to which his followers aspire, since like theirs it is working class. It is his religious status, his Jewishness, to which they respond. Held in high esteem by both groups, the leader's Jewishness is the much sought-after quality of original Christianity that the followers wish to possess. In fact, many expressed sadness at not being Jewish, while others, including the leader's wife, made a point of searching out Jewish blood in their ancestry:

> When I go back, I'm not pure German either, because my grandfather from my mother's side comes from a Jewish line, through the name Zins - this is a Jewish name (Interview, Dec. 2, 1981).[14]

Thus, as a Jewish believer in Jesus, the leader of the HFOI is the <u>idealized representation</u> of goal fulfillment for (1) the inclusive Fellowship group, who are taught the Jewishness of Christianity and the obligation to "pray for the peace of Jerusalem"; for (2) the church audience, who, in

addition, value the missionary endeavour to the Jews; and for (3) the exclusive Messianic group, who wish to recapture original Christianity and to "be part of the promises to the Jewish people". This observation differs from that of Gusfield, which took the personalities of leaders as major factors in their various successes and failures at fulfilling the mobilization and articulation functions (see Gusfield, 1966, pp. 144-5; 147-8). Recourse to the idiosyncracies of personality in the explanation of leadership, however, distracts one "from focusing upon the social significance of the leader as symbol, catalyst, and message bearer" (Worsley, 1968, p. xvii, my emphasis).

The effectiveness of certain persons in exercising the two leadership functions is due, in part, to his or her inherent symbolic value as perceived within the context of a movement's or organization's goals. In contrast to Gusfield (1966, p. 141), who placed a significant value on the leader's "acts...as symbolic of the entire movement", it is here argued that a leader's inherent symbolic value, such as that represented by the a "redeemed Jew" in a conversionist movement, may significantly affect his acts. For example, by virtue of his status he may be privileged to engage in a wide range of activities that appear inconsistent. Moreover, the symbolic value of a leader may be particularly important when an organization is in a becalmed state, either because such a leader gives the illusion of goal achievement or because he

or she is a constant reminder of the organization's message at a time when its realization seems remote. The shift in focus from a leader's instrumental value to his inherent symbolic value enables one to predict that such a leader will have a wide appeal to diverse audiences and will successfully fulfill conflicting leadership functions.

ENDNOTES FOR CHAPTER FIVE

[1]Data for this chapter was gathered over a five year period. The major sources of information were weekly interviews of the leader of the HFOI from Nov. 18, 1981 to March 10, 1982; interviews and testimonials of followers; a questionnaire distributed to the followers, Jan. 1984; a questionnaire-interview of local church ministers; and attendance of meetings and celebrations at the HFOI largely between 1979 and 1982. The author also accompanied the HFOI on a trip to Israel in March, 1982.

[2]See: Jeffrey K. Hadden and Charles E. Swann, Prime Time Preachers: The Rising Power of Televangelism (Reading, Mass.: Addison Wesley Publishing Co.), 1981; David A. Bromley and Anson D. Shupe, Jr., "Moonies" in America: Cult, Church, Crusade (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications), 1979; Michael I. Harrison and John K. Maniha, "Dynamics of Dissenting Movements within Established Organizations: Two Cases and a Theoretical Interpretation", Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, Vol. 17, No. 3, pp. 207-24.

[3]Herbert Blumer, "Social Movements" in Alfred McLung Lee (ed.) Principles of Sociology, rev. 2nd ed., (New York: Barnes and Noble), 1951, held that leadership functions were linked to stages of the movement. The leader's role changes from "reformer," to "statesmen," to "administrator" (p. 203).

[4]See "Colourless Leadership."

[5]Despite the mention of the unique qualities of a leader, a Weberian explanation in which the charismatic leader rules over men because of his followers' belief in "the extraordinary qualities of the specific person" is avoided. Proceeding with the caution voiced by Worsley (1968, p. xvii), an explanation based on the "purely personal charisma" of the leader is replaced with the identification of the specific attributes of the leader, which symbolically link him to the organization's goals. In agreement with Worsley (1968, pp. xvii-xviii), this chapter argues that "the charismatic leader must always be a symbolizer," where "the agent, personal or impersonal, is always attached to (whether bearer or creator) a message." Thus, the reflexive, interactional aspects of the leader's articulating and mobilizing activities are profoundly affected by his

perceived symbolic value, which is viewed in the context of the organization's goals. See K. J. Ratnam, "Charisma and Political Leadership," Political Studies, Vol. 12 No. 3 (1964), pp. 341-54 and Ann Ruth Willner and Dorothy Willner, "The Rise and Role of Charismatic Leaders," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science (March, 1965, pp. 82-84).

[6]See D. H. Mackay, Triumphs of His Grace: Gospel Triumphs Among the Jewish People in Hamilton, Ontario, Canada, 1892-1974, 2nd. ed. (Caledonia, Ont.: Acts Books), 1978. The present leader furnished the author with a record of his speaking engagements in the local church community between and including the years 1973 and 1981.

[7]With the integration of the International Missionary Council and World Council of Churches in 1961, a new Committee on the Church and the Jewish People was struck. This replaced the Committee on the Christian Approach to the Jews established in 1928. According to Gerald Anderson, "The Church and the Jewish People," Missiology, Vol. 2 No. 3 (1974), p. 280.

> most of the church agencies related to the Committee, and which had, up to that point, seen their responsibility toward the Jewish people in terms of mission, have changed their attitude and now speak of this responsibility in terms of dialogue.

[8]Even if the pastor's suspicion may be correct that sympathizers of the Palestinian Liberation Organization from the nearby university campus were responsible, it nevertheless reveals either his tactfulness or his ignorance of the sentiments of some Jews in the community. In an interview, the leader of a Jewish students organization admitted there was little he could do unless the leader of the HFOI became aggressive or intrusive.

[9]Fruchtenbaum, Hebrew Christianity: Its Theology, History, and Philosophy (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House), 1975, p. 107.

[10]The trips to Israel had been annual up until September, 1981.

[11]The leader of the HFOI observed, generally,

> There seems to be a great number of non-Jews, Messianic non-Jewish

> believers, who wear a yarmulka, wear a Ch'ai [Hebrew word for "life" worn as a pendant], Jewish things to identify themselves with Jewish people (Interview, Jan. 27, 1982).

[12]Corroborating this view, the leader of the HFOI noted that

> there are some Messianic congregations who absolutely don't emphasize it. They feel they should be attracting rather than proselytizing (Interview, Jan. 6, 1982).

As one adherent of the Messianic service characterized the approach to the Jews:

> Instead of missionizing, there tends to be an understanding of love and friendship and respect. Nothing pushy. (Questionnaire, Jan. 1984).

[13]Apart from the leader, there are two half-Jewish couples, with their five children in attendance, who are also considered half-Jewish. The leader's two half-Jewish daughters also attend with their children. Another Jewish "believer" who had attended with his Gentile wife was "turned off" by the Jewish liturgy in the service. Indeed, the leader of the HFOI pointed to the paucity of Jews in his own group as a proof that the accusations that Messianic Judaism is an elaborate "ruse" to trick Jews into becoming Christians were false: "Obviously, Jews have not been tricked by [our Messianic assembly]" (Interview, Feb. 10, 1982).

[14]One member of the Messianic congregation in Toronto, a light skinned Trinidadian woman related that her last name was actually a medieval Portugese rendition of a Jewish name. She also interpreted some of her grandmother's household superstitions as having some link with Judaism (Interview, international conference of the MJAA, July 1982).

CHAPTER SIX

Conclusions

The emphasis on organizational analysis, which has marked recent studies of new religious movements (Beckford, 1973), has shifted the focus away from the simple classification of religious movements or groups as sects, churches or denominations. Yet, organizational analyses can reveal new classifications among those already mentioned rather than replace them, for such classifications are meaningful as relative points on a scale indicating tension with the environment. Accordingly, we can place Hebrew Christianity, in general, on the scale between the denomination and the sect, reflecting the "uneasy tension" between the "para-church" organizations and the churches. Indeed, their major role in American Protestantism since the beginning of the nineteenth century (Winter, 1980, p. 200) would seem to necessitate the introduction of the much neglected, though important, category of the "para-church" on the church-sect continuum. Since mission societies have spawned sects, such as the Salvation Army and the Christian and Missionary Alliance from the Anglican and the Presbyterian churches, respectively, the para-church category

also would account more accurately for the trajectories of certain religious groups. Furthermore, its inclusion on the church-sect continuum is in keeping with the para-church's rising popularity on the religious scene (Winter, 1980, p. 205).

The discovery of the para-church or mission society as an important category on the church-sect continuum is pertinent to Weber's (1948, p. 314) passing reference to the notion of an ecclesiola in ecclesia, a concept which Joachim Wach (1944, pp. 173-186) expanded and David Martin (1962) later employed to identify the "non-sectarian" origins of denominations in England. What Weber referred to as "the conventicle of the exemplary Christians" accommodated within the Church, was elaborated by Wach into three sub-types, the collegium pietatis, the fraternitas, and the order. Predictably, these largely descriptive categories were limited in their application and therefore regularly omitted from church-sect models. Yet, it is also true that they denoted groups in low to high degrees of protest against and separation from the Church. It is this aspect of Wach's ecclesiola in ecclesia that finds its parallel in the church-sect continuum of Stark and Bainbridge. Moreover, the ecclesiola in ecclesia concept is itself similar to the notion of the para-church or mission society in that its activities are supported by the Church but often significantly deviate from, if not challenge, its normative

beliefs and practices.

Having placed the Hebrew Christian movement, in general, on the para-church node between sect and denomination on the church-sect continuum, variations among individual Hebrew Christian organizations will represent greater or lesser tension with the Church environment. The extent to which a group upholds ideological difference from the surrounding churches, encourages antagonism towards them or experiences separation from them will be affected by several factors, the style of leadership being significant in the example of the Hamilton Friends of Israel. Such inter-organizational variance in the leader's relationship to the churches is also found among Messianic congregations. Although the Messianic movement, in general, is placed at the sectarian end of the church-sect continuum, congregations vary in the degree to which they are in tension with the surrounding Protestant community, and the style of leadership profoundly affects this relationship. For example, the leader of the Beth Yeshuah congregation in Philadelphia, David Chernoff, mobilizes his followers with a personal emotional appeal, emphasizing charismatic worship and Israeli dancing, insisting that members live close the congregation and marry only other Messianic Jews. By comparison, the leader of the Beth Messiah congregation in Washington, D.C., Daniel Juster, lays greater emphasis on articulation to the

Protestant community, engaging in ecumenical dialogues, no doubt because he is the movement's leading theologian. Judging from the media coverage, it is Beth Yeshua and not Beth Messiah, which has earned itself an image as a cult or radical sect.

In contrast to these two Messianic congregations, the HFOI actually sits on two different points of the church-sect continuum. True to the organization's Hebrew Christian mission mandate, the Weekly Praise and Prayer Fellowship operates as a para-church that does not officialy replace the members' affiliation with local churches. Yet in keeping with Messianic Judaism's separationist aim, the Sunday Messianic group functions as a sect that precludes membership in a "home church". Such a "mixed" organizational type has been anticipated by Curtis and Zurcher (1974) in their discussion of social movement organizations. They noted that the presence of opposing types of goals and membership requirements, i.e., both instrumental and expressive goal orientations and/or inclusive and exclusive membership requirements, need not suggest internal conflict or schism, "although it might reveal a potential for either" (1974, p. 357).

Curtis and Zurcher's (1974, p. 360) summary of congruent components of an organization, drawn in large part from the work of Zald and Ash (1966) and including such pairs as expressive goals-exclusive membership and instrumental

(purposive) goals and inclusive membership, is helpful in understanding the non-conflictual existence of two groups within the HFOI. Although not entirely "pure" types - indeed, Curtis and Zurcher (1974) anticipate non-congruent (mixed) types - they are, nonetheless, quite separate in their stated goals and membership structures. Each is a congruent organizational type. Moreover, under the guidance of one leader, their separate functions are conscientiously maintained, if only to avail itself of as large a constituency as is necessary for its survival.

If survival is its only aim, the HFOI might retain its two subgroups in tandom without schism. But the growth trend of the larger Messianic movement is bound to have an impact on the Messianic Sunday group. Already, the Messianic followers, unlike the Weekly Praise and Prayer Fellowshippers, have expressed concern that there be more Jewish members,[1] for the emphasis on Jewish liturgy and the preservation of Jewish identity is hardly tenable in a group that is overwhelmingly Gentile. An increase in Jewish followers would also entail a preference for Jewish spouses, which would make the Gentile involvement in, not to mention the church support of, the HFOI an obstacle to both the fulfillment of the movement's goals of independence and its self-conception as a specifically Jewish enclave in the Christian community.

This transition may already be in process, for the leader's impending retirement spurred a search for new talent among the small community of Messianic Jews in the area. A young couple from the Messianic congregation in Toronto, Melech Israel, replaced the HFOI leader in 1984-85 when he took a "sabbatical" in Israel. The presence of a young leader, whose previous experience included a job as assistant to the director of the Jews for Jesus, Toronto office, and elder in a Messianic congregation, has brought to the HFOI a more confident advocate of Messianic Judiasm. The HFOI leader presently in Israel had been raised as a Christian, and his Jewishness, which emerged much later in life, was given a tentative, self-conscious expression. In contrast, the young Messianic leader was a convert who consciously refused to part with his Jewish identity. While his predecessor was usually in the company of Gentiles, the new leader's involvement with the JFJ and Melech Israel always provided him with the company of young Jewish Christians like himself, who wore their Jewish identity proudly, if also somewhat aggressively.

Such an emphasis on Jewishness may well be the cause of a rift in the HFOI between those whose involvement in the Weekly Praise and Prayer Fellowship served to "deepen" their Christian identity and those whose participation in the Messianic group is intended to enhance their Jewish identity. Indeed, as the concern to draw more Jewish followers to the

HFOI grows, a more aggressive demonstration of Jewishness is likely, as is the consequent alienation of the Gentile element in the organization.

The potential schism in the HFOI, which unquestionably signals the age-old conflicts of generations, also highlights the two major "interest groups" in the Messianic movement. For the Jews and the Gentiles each have their own agenda, and the Messianic movement has provided the context in which each is lived out. The Jewish agenda might be entitled "assimilation", and the Gentile agenda, "acceptance".

The significant drop in religiosity among American Jews over the last three or four generations is well documented.[2] Synagogue membership, while high, is not transferred to high rates of participation in religious services (Goldstein and Goldscheider, 1968, pp. 194-5). American Jewry has entered the age in which the "nominal Jew" is the norm. Traditional forms of religious observance have decreased while new forms of Jewish identification, which do not conflict with secular life pursuits, are sought. The state of Israel, of course, has been the single most important focus of Jewish identity, and other national and international Jewish organizations serve a similar function. Two observers of the American Jewish scene over three generations concluded:

> ...[I]ntegration into American society has led to the abandonment of traditional forms of religious behaviour and the transition to forms that are more secular but within a Jewish context. Strong identification factors are evident with the preservation of some form of religious affiliation; at the same time, all the indications point to the rejection of the traditional concepts of religiousness (Goldstein and Goldscheider, 1968, p. 228).

Certainly the paradox of modernity for Jews in North America is the freedom to preserve their identity and the opportunity to pursue a high degree of assimilation. Goldstein and Goldscheider (1968, p. 229) observed that over three generations the Jews in America were inclined to develop new forms of Jewish identity "with an emphasis on those aspects that are congruent with Americanization".

> Religious commitments are retained when they are functionally integrated within a secular context and where retention of Jewish identity is possible in the form that is expected and condoned by the majority community (Goldstein and Goldscheider, 1968, pp. 229-30).

Given their findings, the phenomenon of Messianic Judaism, which has witnessed young Jews easily claiming their Jewish identity, upholding it in a variety of traditional practices and affiliations, while adopting the Christian doctrine, is not surprising. Indeed, it does not appear to be incongruent with the trend in North American Jewry to discover new rationales - albeit usually secular ones - for

claiming membership in the group. When Goldscheider and Zuckerman (1984) ask how the structural changes of a religiously and ethnically pluralistic America impinge on the modern American Jew, one could point to the, admittedly extreme, example of the Messianic Jew:

> Does change imply the assimilation of Jews and the demise of the Jewish community? Are there new forms emerging that extend, replace, and redefine Jewishness? Along with the dramatic changes and transformations, are there emerging patterns which are the basis of new forms of Jewish cohesion?

These questions, posed by Goldscheider and Zuckerman and cited by Nathan Glazer in his article on "Jewish Forebodings" (1985, p. 34), point to a significant shift within American Jewry. It is not Christian intolerance that is a problem for American Jews, for Glazer (1985, p. 35) notes that

> Jewishness is no longer something embarrassing or demeaning, something to be hidden by denial, by taking a non-Jewish name, or by an aggressive aping of non-Jewish behaviour.

It is the Jewish quest to find new reasons for retaining a religious identity, when the specifically religious ones have become largely remote from experience, that has become the new problem. While it would be easy to view Messianic Judaism as yet another Jewish capitulation to Christian dominance, it is perhaps more revealing to see it as one possible response of assimilated Jews, who have infused their

"secular" Jewish identity with a new religious doctrine that happens to be Christian. That Christianity is viewed as "essentially Jewish" in the movement makes this transition theologically justifiable.

If we can speak about a Gentile agenda in the Messianic movement, it too is a response to the condition of a religiously pluralistic society. The extremely diverse character of Protestantism in North America consists of a multitude of denominations and sects, each with their own "sacred" history and tradition. The birth of Christianity, itself, plays, at best, a secondary role to the origins of its later institutionalized expressions. Messianic Judaism's greatest attraction to Gentiles is its return to the Jewish roots of Christianity. Since Jesus, himself, was a Jew, as were most of his followers comprising the early church, the Jewish orientation of Messianic congregations appears to offer the Gentile adherent the closest approximation of the apostolic church. It also constitutes a dramatic rejection of the subsequent Gentile accretions that took place not only in the Roman Catholic Church, but also in Protestantism.

While the return to "authentic" Christianity is one explanation for Gentile involvement in Messianic Judaism - an explanation that points to its quintessentially sectarian nature - another, related reason must revolve around the place of missions to Jews in Christianity. It is a well

known fact that the Christian missionary imperative to the Jewish people experienced a severe setback after World War II. If Auschwitz had an impact on Jewish theology, it had an equally profound impact on Christian theology. Central to the latter was the acknowledgement of Christian guilt through complicity, indifference, and silence concerning the extermination of the Jewish people in Europe. Gerald Anderson, president of The American Society of Missiology at Wheaton College, for example, unequivocally admitted the church's guilt in this regard:

> Any discussion of the church and the Jewish people must begin with a profound sense of regret, revulsion and repentance on the part of Christians for the discrimination and suffering inflicted on the Jewish people through the centuries, to a large extent as a result of Anti-Semitic ideology fostered by teachings and attitudes perpetuated in the churches, which culminated with the extermination of six million Jews in the holocaust. It is imperative for Christians to unreservedly commit themselves to correcting the negative stereotypes and sub-Christian concepts which have stained the church's attitude toward the Jewish people through the centuries (Anderson, 1974, p. 286).

For many, this endeavour is necessarily linked to a rejection of missions to Jews altogether. The ecumenical movement within Christianity has reserved a place for the Jews, to whom mission has been replaced by "dialogue". Acceptance of "Judaism, as an active, living part of God's

continuing revelation" (Culberton, 1983, p. 118) is to be free of "any hidden agenda of conversion between Christian and Jew" (p. 119), for such an agenda is laden with anti-semitism and self-righteousness (p. 119). A supporter of this view, Father John T. Pawlikowski, O.S.M., chairman of the National Council of Churches Faith and Order Study Group on "Israel", is quoted by Anderson (1974, p. 284):

> For Christianity today the question must be how it can articulate its self-identity without automatically denying the continuing validity of Judaism as an on-going expression of fundamental religious realities after the time of Christ.

Indeed, Father Pawlikowski rejected Romans 9-11 on the ground that its ultimately conversionist message was unacceptable (Anderson, 1974, p. 284). Far from being a lone voice, Father Pawlikowski is joined by other leading spokesmen of of the ecumenical movement, among them Rosemary Reuther, Gregory Baum, and Franklin Littell.[3] Not only are they part of a dominant direction in ecumenical thinking, but they are also representative of the National Council of Churches and the World Council of Churches (Anderson, 1974, p. 286).

Yet, Anderson noted that there is not unanimous support for this view, and he, for one, is unwilling to concede Christianity's mission to the Jews (1974, p. 287ff). Those who uphold the missionary mandate do so, nonetheless, in a community that has made large advances in the direction

of "appreciating" and "accepting" Judaism. Anderson, for example, believes that "Christ fulfills and completes the covenant with Israel" (p. 287), but he also endorses the "possibility of Jews accepting the Lordship of Jesus Christ and remaining with Jewish culture and religious tradition as `Messianic Jews'" (p. 291).

Given the trend in ecumenical circles and missiological discussions toward accepting, even learning from, Judaism, and the self-conscious attempt to right the wrongs of a history of anti-Jewish carnage, it is perhaps predictable that some Christians would be drawn to Messianic Judaism, just as some have been inspired to be "Christian Zionists".[4] For Messianic Judaism proclaims the Christian messiah, while it seeks to preserve much of Jewish tradition and lifestyle. Indeed, it enfolds what has become for some an embarrassingly anti-semitic religion in a shroud of Jewish "legitimacy".

ENDNOTES FOR CHAPTER SIX

[1]

> I would like to see the HFOI expand and also that more Jewish people would attend the services in future (Questionnaire, 1984).
>
> I'm interested where HFOI will go in the future. It can turn into just another gentile charmismatic prayer meeting or grow into a Jewish congregation. They need Jewish people. (Questionnaire, 1984).

[2]See Milton Gordon, Assimilation in American Life (New York: Oxford University Press, Inc., 1964), pp. 106-14, 160-232. Daniel Bell, "Reflections on Jewish Identity: The Risks of Memory", Commentary (June, 1961), reprinted in Daniel Bell, The Winding Passage: Essays and Sociological Journeys, 1960-1980 (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1980) pp. 314-323.

[3]Gregory Baum, "The Doctrinal Basis for Jewish Christian Dialogue", The Ecumenist, Vol. 6, No. 4, 1968, pp. 151-2. Rosemary R. Reuther, "An Invitation to Jewish-Christian Dialogue. In What Can We Say That Jesus Was `The Christ'?" The Ecumentist, Vol. X, No. 2, 1972, p. 17. See also A. Roy Eckardt, Elder and Younger Brothers: The Encounter of Jews and Christians (New York: Scribners), 1967.

[4]Christian Zionism arose largely as a result of the Arab-Israel wars of 1967 and 1973. Prime Minister Begin was especially open to such support, although it is met with a certain uneasiness in Jewish circles. See Richard John Neuhaus, "What the Fundamentalists Want", Commentary, Vol. 79, No. 5 (May, 1985), pp. 41-6. Also: "Orthodox, Evangelicals Confer: An Unprecedented Meeting" by Joseph Polakoff (Washington), Canadian Jewish News (March 3, 1983), p. 1; "Prayer Breakfast Honours Jewish State: American Evangelical Christians Support Israel", by Joe Polakoff (Washington), The Canadian Jewish News (February 24, 1983), p. 9; "Evangelicals Strengthening Bonds with Jews: by Richard Berstein, New York Times (February 6, 1983), p. 1; and the announcement placed in the New York Times (January 8, 1982), "Christians in Solidarity with Israel" by the National Christian Leadership Conference for Israel.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abraham, Ruth. `I Became as a Jew...' n.d., N.p..

Abramowitz, Philip D. "Jews for Jesus Called `Harmful and Deceptive.'" The Jewish Week (January 14, 1983), p. 40.

American Board of Missions to the Jews. The Chosen People, Vol. 21, No. 3 (December, 1915): Vol. 21, No. 3 (December 1925): (December, 1961): (April, 1985).

A Jewish Confession of Faith. (Pamphlet). N.d.

Introducing the Jewish People to Their Messiah. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: ABMJ, 1977.

"Ontario Conference on Prophecy and Passover Demonstrations". (Calendars, March 4-20, 1983; March 2-18, 1984).

American Jewish Committee. The American Jewish Yearbook, 1901-1902. Vol. 3, Philadelphia: The American Jewish Committee, 1902.

Anderson, Gerald. "The Church and the Jewish People: Some Theological Issues and Missiological Concerns". Missiology: An International Review, Vol. 2, No. 3, 1974, pp. 279-93.

Bainbridge, William Sims, and Rodney Stark. "Sectarian Tension". Review of Religious Research, Vol. 22, No. 2 (December, 1980), pp. 105-24.

Baron, David A. "The Jewish Question". Missionary Review of the World (December, 1896), pp. 889-899.

"Israel's Mission to the World, and the Church's Mission to Israel". Missionary Review of the World, (December, 1897), pp. 889-898.

Baum, Gregory. "The Jews, Faith, and Ideology". The Ecumenist, Vol. 10, No. 5, pp. 74-5.

"The Doctrinal Basis for Jewish Christian Dialogue". The Ecumenist, Vol. 6, No. 4, pp. 151-52.

Beckford, James A. "Religious Organization" (A Trend Report and Bibliography). Current Sociology, Vol. 21, No. 2 (1973).

Bell, Daniel. "Reflections on Jewish Identity: The Risks of Memory". (Originally in Commentary, June 1961) The Winding Passage: Essays and Sociological Journeys, 1960-1980, New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1980, pp. 314-323.

Berger, Peter L. "The Sociological Study of Sectarianism." Social Research, Vol. 21 (Winter, 1954), pp. 467-85.

Blackstone, William E. "Palestine for the Jews." Memorandum presented to President Harrison, March 5, 1891.

"May the United States Intercede for the Jews?" Our Day, Vol. 8, No. 46 (October, 1891).

Blumenfeld, R. L. "Jews for Jesus." The Varsity, Vol. 103, No. 24 (November 5, 1982).

Blumer, Herbert. "Social Movements." In Alfred McLung Lee (ed.), Principles of Sociology, Rev. 2nd ed. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1951, pp. 199-220.

Blumstock, Robert E. The Evangelization of the Jews: A Study in Interfaith Relations. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oregon, 1964.

"Fundamentalism, Prejudice, and Missions to Jews." Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, Vol. 5, pp. 27-35.

"Missions to Jews: Reduction of Inter-Group Tension." Practical Anthropology, Vol. 14 (January-February), 1967, pp. 37-43.

Bowler, M. G. "The Hebrew Christian and the Church." The American Hebrew Christian, Vol. 2 (Spring, 1975), pp. 16-20.

Bromley, David A. and Anson Shupe, Jr. "Moonies in America: Cult, Church, Crusade. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1979.

Brummer, Alex. "Yeshua Cult Pulsates to a Hebrew Chant." The Guardian (May, 27, 1985), p. 5.

Budoff, Barry. "Law and Grace." The American Messianic Jewish Quarterly, Vol. 3 (Summer, 1978), pp. 7-11.

Buckner, J. H. Jewish Evangelism, A Study: How to Win a Son of Abraham to the son of God. Berne, Indiana: Light and Hope Publications, 1950.

Chalmers, Thomas M. "A Call to Prayer for Israel." In A. E. Thompson, A Century of Jewish Missions. Chicago: F. J. Revell Co., 1902, pp. 269-76.

Christian Century. "Messianic Jews." (October 13), 1982, pp. 1029-30.

Christianity Today. "National Scene (November 21), 1980, p. 62.

"Jewish Christians: Messianic Congregations Form Mini Denomination." (August 17), 1979.

"Jews for Jesus: Under New Management." (September 28), 1973, p. 43.

Cohen, Philip. The Hebrew Christian and His Neighbourhood. (pamphlet). New York: ABMJ, N.D.

Cohn, Leopold. A Modern Missionary to an Ancient People. New York: ABMJ (originally published, 1908), 1948.

Coleman, John A. "Church-sect Typology and Organizational Precariousness." Sociological Analysis, Vol. 24 (Summer, 1968), pp. 55-66.

Couper, W. J. "Jewish Nationality Since the Time of Christ." In The New Jewry: A Challenge to the Church (Papers read at the Jewish Conference, Edinburgh, February 21, 1917). Edinburgh, 1917, pp. 1-14.

Crum, Bartley C. Behind the Silken Curtain. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1947.

Cuddihy, John Murray. No Offense: Civil Religion and Protestant Taste. New York: The Seabury Press, 1978.

Culbertson, Philip. "Doing our Homework: Fifteen Steps Toward Christian-Jewish Dialogue in Local Congregations." Journal of Ecumenical Studies, Vol. 20, No. 1 (Winter, 1983), pp. 118-23.

Curtis, Russell L., Jr. and Louis Zurcher, Jr. "Social Movements: An Analytical Exploration of Organizational Forms." Social Problems, Vol. 21 (Fall, 1974), pp. 356-70.

Curtiss, Samuel Ives. "Present Conditions of Jews in Russia." Missionary Review of the World (December, 1898), pp. 923-25.

Currie, William E. "Messianics Judaism Examined." American Messianic Fellowship Monthly, October, 1975.

Dalman, Gustaf. Christianity and Judaism (translated by Rev. G. H. Box). London, Oxford: Williams and Norgate, 1901.

Delitzsch, Franz. "Biblical Thoughts on the Conversion of the Jews." Missionary Review of the World, Vol. 3, 1890, pp. 575-79.

Demerath III, N. J. "In a Sow's Ear: A Reply to Goode." Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, Vol. 6, No. 1 (Spring, 1967), pp. 77-84.

Demerath III, N. J. and J. Thiessen. "On Spitting Against the Wind: Organizational Precariousness and Irreligion." American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 71 (May, 1966), pp. 674-87.

Dewitz, Ludwig. "Is the Term Hebrew Christian Justified?" American Hebrew Christian, Vol. 2 (Spring, 1975), pp. 21-23.

Duguid, Marilyn. "So...How Can I Win My Jewish Neighbour?" Evangelical Baptist (November, 1981), pp. 11-15.

Eichhorn, Max David. Evangelizing the American Jew. Middle Village, N.Y.: Jonathan David Publishers, 1978.

Eister, Allan W. "Toward a Radical Critique of Church-sect Typologizing." Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, Vol. 6, No. 1 (Spring, 1967), pp. 85-90.

Elazar, Daniel. The Organizational Dynamics of American Jewry. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1976.

Ellison, H. L. "The Riddle of Hebrew Christianity." Hebrew Christian Alliance Quarterly, Vol. 31, No. 1 (Spring, 1945).

Eyre, Joseph. "Observations on the Prophecies Relating to the Restoration of the Jews." (pamphlet). London, 1777.

Feinberg, Charles L. "Should Christians Keep the Sabbath?" (pamphlet). New York: ABMJ, N.d.

Finkelstein, Joseph. "`Beit Ha-sefer Ha-adom Ha-katan'/ Little Red Schoolhouse.'" American Messianic Jewish Quarterly, No. 2 (Spring, 1979), pp. 17-19.

"Messianic Culture and Identity." American Messianic Jewish Quarterly. Vol. 3 (Summer, 1976), pp. 10-13.

Flynn, Leslie B. "What the Church Owes the Jew." (pamphlet). N.p., N.d.

Freeman, David H. "Withholding the Gospel from the Jews." Jewish Voice, Vol. 16, No. 4 (May, 1982).

Freuder, Samuel. A Missionary's Return to Judaism: The Truth About the Christian Missions to the Jews. New York: Sinai Publishing Co., 1915.

Friends General Conference. Friends General Conference Quarterly, Vol. 16, No. 1, Fall, 1983.

Fruchtenbaum, Arnold. Hebrew Christianity: Its Theology, History, and Philosophy. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House, 1974.

"Jewishness and Hebrew Christianity." Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: ABMJ, No. d., pp. 2-22.

Frydland, Rachmiel. "Messianic Rabbinic Dialogue." American Messianic Jewish Quarterly, No. 3 (Summer, 1979), pp. 8-11.

"When Talmud is Right." American Messianic Jewish Quarterly, No. 4 (Fall, 1978), pp. 8-10.

"Use of Rabbinic Lore." American Messianic Jewish Quarterly, No. 3 (Summer, 1977), pp. 15-16.

"Siddur and Talmud: Two Great Jewish Books." American Messianic Jewish Quarterly, No. 3 (Summer, 1976), pp. 19-23.

"The Siddur and the Messianic Jew." American Messianic Jewish Quarterly, (Fall, 1976), pp. 10-14.

"The Talmud Treasury and Jewish Messianism." American Messianic Jewish Quarterly, No. 3 (Summer, 1975), pp. 8-12.

Frydland, Rachmiel and Elliot Klayman. The Messianic Outreach, Vol. 1, No. 4 (June, 1982).

Gade, Ralph M. "What is Messianic Judaism?" (pamphlet). Chicago: American Association for Jewish Evangelism, N.d.

Gaebelein, A. C. "The Time to Favour Zion." Missionary Review of the World, Vol. 10, 1897, pp. 899-902.

Gerlach, Luther and Virginia Hine. People, Power, Change. Indianapolis: Bobbs Merrill, 1970.

Gidney, W. T. "Christian Missions to Israel." Missionary Review of the World, Vol. 12, 1899, pp. 889-898.

Glasser, Arthur F. "Keep Jewish Heritage: Fuller." American Messianic Jewish Quarterly, No. 4 (Fall, 1976), p. 20.

Glazer, Nathan. "On Jewish Forebodings." Commentary, Vol. 80 (August, 1985), pp. 32-36.

Glick, Ira O. "The Hebrew Christians: A Marginal Religious Group." In Marshall Sklare (ed.), The Jews: Social Patterns of an American Group. New York: Free Press, 1958, pp. 415-431.

Glock, Charles Y. and Rodney Stark. Religion and Society in Tension. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1965.

Goble, Phillip E. Everything You Need to Grow a Messianic Yeshiva. Pasadena, Calif.: William Carey Library, 1981.

Messianic Judaism: A Biblical Apologetic With a View to Liturgical Reform. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Fuller Theological Seminary, 1975.

Everything You Need to Grow a Messianic Synagogue. Pasadena, Calif.: William Carey Library, 1974.

Goldberg, Karl. "Judaizing and Jewish Evangelism." Buffalo Hebrew Christian, No. 122 (Summer, 1977), pp. 1-3.

Goldberg, Louis. "Which Law?" American Messianic Jewish Quarterly, No. 2 (Spring, 1980), pp. 4-7.

"Biblical Messianic Jews." American Messianic Jewish Quarterly, No. 3 (Summer, 1979), pp. 5-11.

Goldscheider, Calvin and Alan Zuckerman. The Transformation of the Jews. University of Chicago Press, 1984.

Goldstein, Sidney and Calvin Goldscheider. Jewish Americans: Three Generations in a Jewish Community. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1968.

Goode, Erich. "Some Critical Observations on the Church-sect Dimension." Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, Vol. 6, No. 1 (Spring, 1967), pp. 69-77.

Goodnow, A. W. "The Jews and Eschatology." Baptist Quarterly Review, Vol. 14 (1892), pp. 443-54.

Gordon, Milton. Assimilation in American Life. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Gracey, J. T. "The Jew in the Nineteenth Century." Missionary Review of the World, Vol. 3 (1890), pp. 181-87.

Grounds, Vernon. "The Delicate Diplomacy of Jewish-Christian Dialogue." Christianity Today (April 24, 1981), pp. 26-9.

Gusfield, J. R. "Functional Areas of Leadership in Social Movements." Sociological Quarterly, Vol. 7 (1966), pp. 136-56.

Gutwirth, Jacques. "Jews Among Evangelists in Los Angeles." Jewish Journal of Sociology, Vol. 24, No. 1 (June, 1982), pp. 39-55.

Hadden, Jeffrey. The Gathering Storm in the Churches. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1969.

Harney, Robert and Harold Troper. The Immigrants: A Portrait of the Urban Experience from 1890-1931 (Toronto). Toronto: Van Nostrand and Reinhold, 1975.

Harrison, Michael I. and John K. Maniha. "Dynamics of Dissenting Movements Within Established Organizations: Two Cases and a Theoretical Interpretation." Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, Vol. 17, No. 3, 1978, pp. 207-24.

Harrison, Paul. M. Authority and Freedom in the Free Church Tradition. Princeton University Press, 1959.

Heberle, R. Social Movements. New York: Appleton, Century, Crafts, Inc., 1951.

Hebrew Christian Alliance of America. Report of Fiscal General Conference, April 6th to 9th, 1915. New York: HCAA, 1915.

Papers, Addresses and Proceedings of the Second General Conference, May 2nd to 5th, 1916. New York, HCAA: 1916.

Hertzberg, Arthur. "America is Indifferent." In Arthur Hertzberg, et. al., The Outbursts that Await Us: Three Essays on Religion and Culture in the United States. New York: Macmillan, 1963.

Hutchens, James M. "Messianic Judaism: A Progress Report." Missiology: An International Review, Vol. 5, No. 3 (July, 1977), pp. 285-99.

Holton, Margaret Lindsey. The Spirit of Toronto: 1834-1984. Toronto: Image Publishing, Inc., 1984.

Howe, Irving. The World of Our Fathers. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1976.

International Missionary Council (IMC). The Christian Approach to the Jew. (Proceedings of the Budapest/ Warsaw Conference, 1927. IMC, 1927.

Isichei, Elizabeth Allo. "From Sect to Church in English Quakerism." British Journal of Sociology, Vol. 15, No. 3 (1964), pp. 207-22.

Jerram, Charles. "An Essay Tending to Show the Grounds of Scripture for the Future Restoration of Israel." London, 1796.

Jocz, Jakob. The Jewish People in the Time of Christ. London: S.P.C.K., 1954.

Johnson, Benton. "Church and Sect Revisited." Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, Vol. 10, No. 2 (1971), pp. 124-37.

"On Church and Sect." American Sociological Review, Vol. 28 (August, 1963), pp. 539-49.

Juster, Daniel. "A Messianic Jew Pleads his Case." Christianity Today (April, 1981), pp. 22-24.

"Ets Hayim Day School." American Messianic Jew, No. 2, (1981), pp. 15-17.

"Messianic Judaism and the Church." American Messianic Jew, No. 4 (1981), pp. 13-14.

"A New Wall of Partition." American Messianic Jewish Quarterly, No. 2 (Spring, 1979), pp. 8-10.

"Covenant Theology." American Messianic Jewish Quarterly, No. 3 (Summer, 1977), pp. 10-12.

Jewishness and Jesus (booklet). Downer Grove, Ill.: Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship, 1977.

True Dialog (booklet). Havertown, Penn.: Messianic Jewish Alliance of America, 1977.

"Messianic Jews." Action (1976), pp. 16-24.

"The Yarmulke." American Messianic Jewish Quarterly, No. 2 (Spring, 1976), pp. 15-16.

"Jewish Liturgy and Messianic Faith." American Messianic Jewish Quarterly, No. 4 (Fall, 1975), pp. 12-15.

Kac, Arthur W. The Rebirth of the State of Israel: Is it of God or Man? London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1958.

Kahler, Erich. "Forms and Features of Anti-Judaism." Social Research, Vol. 6, No. 4 (November, 1939), pp. 455-88.

Killian, L. M. "Social Movements." In R. E. L. Faris (ed.), Handbook of Modern Sociology. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1964.

Klayman, Elliot. "The Importance of Jewish Identity." American Messianic Jew, No. 4 (1982), pp. 4-6.

Kohn, Rachael L. E. "Dual Membership and Sectarian Status: The Case of a Hebrew Christian Group." Studies in Religion, Vol. 12, No. 2, pp. 157-66.

Lemond, Barbara. Bound With This Chain. Caledonia, Ont.: Acts Books, 1978.

Levy, Mark John. "Jewish Ordinances in the Light of Hebrew Christianity." Hebrew Christian Alliance Quarterly, Vol. 1, Nos. 3 & 4 (June & October), 1917.

Lewis, Paul. "A Treatise on the Future Restoration of the Jews and Israelites to Their Own Land...Address'd to the Jews" (pamphlets). London, 1747.

Lichtenstein, I. The Points of Contact Between Evangelical and Jewish Doctrine. Translated by Mrs. David Baron. London: Hebrew Christian Testimony to Israel, 1908.

Two Letters: Or What I Really Wish. Written 1887, translated by David Baron. London: Hebrew Christian Testimony to Israel: 1903.

A Jewish Mirror or the Scriptures Reflecting Christ. Translated by Mrs. David Baron. London: Hebrew Christian Testimony to Israel, N.d.

Mackay, Mrs. D. H. Triumphs of His Grace: Memoirs of Gospel Triumphs Among the Jewish People in Hamilton, Ontario, Canada, 1892-1974. Acts Books, 1977, rev. 1978.

McCarthy, John D. and Mayer N. Zald. "Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory." American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 82, No. 6 (May, 1977), pp. 1212-41.

Martin, David. "The Denomination." British Journal of Sociology, Vol. 13 (March, 1962), pp. 1-14.

Matheson, W. S. "The Chairman's Summing Up." The New Jewry. Edinburgh: Publications Office, 1917.

Mathieson, ¬J. E. "The Evangelization of the Jew." Missionary Review of the World, Vol. 7 (1894), pp. 904-09.

McLoughlin, William G. Revivals, Awakenings, and Reform. University of Chicago Press, 1978.

Millgram, Abraham. Jewish Worship. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1971.

Mills, Sanford C. "I Am Accused: A Hebrew Christian Refutes the Charge that He has Left Judaism." Shepherd of Israel (ABMJ) (January, 1962), pp. 1-2.

Morton, W. T. "The Jewish Problem of Today." The New Jewry. Edinburgh: Publications Office, 1917.

Neuhause, Richard John. "What the Fundamentalists Want." Commentary, Vol. 79, No. 5 (May, 1985), pp. 41-6.

Newman, Elias. "Looking Back Twenty-five Years." Hebrew Christian Alliance Quarterly, Vol. 25, No. 2 (Summer, 1940).

Niebuhr, Richard. Social Sources of Denominationalism. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958.

O'Dea, Thomas F. "Sects and Cults." International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, Vols. 13 & 14. New York: The Macmillan Co. and The Free Press; London: Collier Macmillan, 1968.

Presbyterian Church in Canada. Pre-Assembly Congress of the Presbyterian Church in Canada. Toronto: Board of Foreign Missions, Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1913.

Price, Robert M. "An Evangelical Version of the `Double Covenant'" New Possibilities for Jewish-Fundamentalist Dialogue." Journal of Ecumenical Studies, Vol. 21, No. 1. (Winter, 1983), pp. 33-42.

Quebedeaux, Richard. The Worldly Evangelicals. San Francisco: Harper and Row Publishers, 1978.

Rausch, David. Messianic Judaism: Its History, Theology, and Polity. New York, Toronto: Edwin Mellen Press, 1982.

"The Messianic Jewish Congregational Movement." The Christian Century, September, 1982b, pp. 926-29.

"Jews for Yeshuah." Eternity Magazine, Vol. 3, No. 6, June 1982c, pp. 22-23.

"Jews Evangelized: Messianic Jews." Midstream (May, 1979), pp. 36-41.

Zionism Within Early American Fundamentalism, 1878-1918. New York and Toronto: Edwin Mellen Press, 1979b.

"Arno C. Gaebelein (1861-1945): Fundamentalist, Protestant, Zionist." American Jewish History, Vol. 68 (September, 1978), pp. 43-56.

Redekop, Calvin. "A New Look at Sect Development." Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, Vol. 13 (September, 1974), pp. 345-52.

Rich, Lawrence. "A Look at the Origins and Development of the MJAA." American Messianic Jewish Quarterly, No. 5 (Winter, 1979), pp. 4-7.

Rohold, S. B. "Israel's Condition and the Church's Duty." In Pre-Assembly Congress of the Presbyterian Church in Canada. Toronto: Board of Foreign Missions, Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1913, pp. 142-44.

"Missions to Jews, Statistical Table, 1913." In Pre-Assembly Congress of the Presbyterian Church in Canada (Appendix). Toronto: Based of Foreign Missions, Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1913, N.p.

The Jews In Canada (2nd ed.). Toronto: Board of Home Missions, Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1913.

The War and the Jew. Toronto: The Macmillan of Canada Co., Ltd., 1915.

Ratnam, K. J. "Charisma and Political Leadership." Political Studies, Vol. 12, No. 3, (1964), pp. 341-54.

Rosen, Moishe. "A Plea for Unity." American Messianic Jewish Quarterly, No. 2 (Spring, 1976), pp. 17-18.

Share the New Life With a Jew. Chicago: Moody Press, 1976.

Jews for Jesus. Old Tappan, N.J.: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1974.

Rosen, Bernard C. "Minority Group in Transition: A Study of Adolescent Religious Conviction and Conduct." In Marshall Sklare (ed.) The Jews: Social Patters of an American Group. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1958, pp. 336-46.

Rowe, Edward. Why We Haven't Won the Jew (partially published in Eternity Magazine, 1960). N.p., N.d.

Sarna, Jonathan, E. "From Necessity to Virtue: The Hebrew Christianity of Gideon Lederer." Iliff Review., Vol. 37, No. 1 (Winter, 1980), pp. 27-33.

Scanzoni, John. "A Note on Method for the Church-Sect Typology." Sociology Analysis, Vol. 26 (1965), pp. 189-203.

"Innovation and Constancy in the Church-sect Typology." American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 71 (1965), pp. 320-27.

Schaeffer, Edith. Christianity is Jewish. Wheaton, Ill.: Tyndale House Publishers, 1975 (4th printing, 1978).

Schodde, George. "The Evangelization of Israel." Missionary Review of the World, Vol. 4 (1891), pp. 914-21.

"Gospel Work in Israel." Missionary Review of the World, Vol. 9 (1896), pp. 277-80.

"Gospel Work for Israel." Missionary Review of the World, Vol. 11 (1898), pp. 918-20.

Schonfield, Hugh J. The History of Jewish Christianity. London: Duckworth, 1936.

Sharot, Stephen. "A Jewish Christian Adventist Movement." Jewish Journal of Sociology, Vol. 10, No. 1 (1968) pp. 35-45.

Sklare, Marshall. "Church and Laity Among Jews." Annals of the American Academy of Religion. Vol. 332 (November, 1960), pp. 60-70.

Conservative Judaism: An American Religious Movement. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1955.

Snow, Ruth Fleischer. "Anti-Semitism and the Church." American Messianic Jew, No. 2 (Spring, 1980), pp. 22-8.

Sobel, B. Z. Hebrew Christianity: The Thirteenth Tribe. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1974.

"The Tools of Legitimation: Zionism and the Hebrew Christian Movement." Jewish Journal of Sociology, Vol. 10, No. 2 (December, 1968), pp. 241-49.

"Protestant Evangelists and the Formulation of a Jewish Racial Mystique: The Missionary Discovery of Sociology. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, Vol. 5, No. 3 (Fall, 1966), pp. 343-56.

"Legitimation and Antisemitism as Factors in the Functioning of a Hebrew Christian Mission." Jewish Journal of Social Studies, Vol. 23, No. 3 (July, 1961), pp. 170-86.

Sombart, Werner. The Jews and Modern Capitalism. (Originally published 1913) New York: Burt Franklin, 1969.

Stamp, J. S. The Benefits Which Will Accrue to the Church of Christ from the Conversion of the Jews. London: British Society for that Propogation of the Gospel Among the Jews, 1843. Reprinted, New York: American Society for the Melioration of the Condition of the Jews, 1846.

Stark, Rodney, William Sims Bainbridge. "Of Churches, Sects, and Cults: Preliminary Concepts for a Theory of Religious Movements." Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, Vol. 18, pp. 117-31.

Steinberg, Stephen. "Reform Judaism: The Origin of a `Church Movement.'" Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, Vol. 5 (1965), pp. 117-29.

Swatos, William H. "Church-sect and Cult: Bringing Mysticism Back In." Sociological Analysis, Vol. 42, No. 1, pp. 17-26.

Takayama, Peter K. and Susanne B. Darnell. "The Aggressive Organization and the Reluctant Environment: The Vulnerability of an Inter-Faith Coordinating Agency." Review of Religious Research, Vol. 20, No. 3 (Summer, 1979), pp. 315-34.

Thompson, A. E. A Century of Jewish Missions. Chicago: F. H. Revell Co., 1902.

Troeltsch, Ernest. The Social Teachings of the Christian Churches, Vol. 2 New York: Macmillan, 1931.

Tweedie, John A. "How Far is the Jewish Soil Prepared?" The New Jewry. Edinburgh: Publications Office, 1917.

Vinocur, John. "A Most Special Cardinal." The New York Times Magazine (March 20) 1983, p. 29ff.

Wach, Joachim. Sociology of Religion. University of Chicago Press, 1944.

Wallis, Roy. "Sex, Violence, and Religion." Update: A Quarterly on New Religious Movements, Vol. 7, No. 4 (December, 1983), pp. 8-11.

The Road to Total Freedom: A Sociological Analysis of Scientology. New York: Columbia University Press, 1977.

Weatherbe, Stephen. The Case of the Messianic Jews: An Enigma to Christianity and an Irritant to Judaism in Alberta." Alberta Report (April 1, 1985), p. 36.

Webster, J. T. "Some Effects of the War on the Jews." In The New Jewry. Edinburgh: Publications Office, 1917, pp. 27-42.

Wiener, Alfred A. "What Should Be the Attitude Toward a Christian Toward a Jewish Person? Fellowship of Christian Testimony to the Jews, 1965.

Wilson, Bryan. Religion in a Sociological Perspective. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.

Magic and the Millenium. Frogmore, St. Albans, Herts: Paladin, 1975.

"An Analysis of Sect Development." American Sociological Review, Vol. 25 (February, 1959), pp. 3-15.

Winter, Ralph D. "Protestant Mission societies and the `Other Protestant Schism.'" In Ross P. Scherer (ed.) American Denominational Organization: A Sociological View. Pasadena, Calif.: William Carey Library, 1980, pp. 194-224.

Wolff, Joseph. Travels and Adventures of the Rev. Joseph Wolff, D.D., L.L.D. London: Saunders, Otley, & Co., 1861.

Women's Missionary Society of the Presbyterian Church. The Royal Road. Women's Missionary Society of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1927, pp. 83-93.

Yinger, J. Milton. The Scientific Study of Religion. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1970.

Religion, Society, and the Individual. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1957.

Zakuta, Leo. A Protest Movement Becalmed: A Study of Change in the CCF. University of Toronto Press, 1964.

Zald, Mayer and P. Denton. "From Evangelism to General Service: On the Transformation of the Y.M.C.A." Administrative Service Quarterly, Vol. 8 (June, 1963), pp. 214-34.

Zimmerman, Elias. Why Did God Choose the Jews? (Pamphlet). Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: ABMJ, N.d.

Zurcher, L. A. "Stable Resources of Protestant Movements: The Multi-Organizational Field." Social Forces, Vol. 52 (September, 1973), pp. 53-61.

TAPES:

Recorded at the Messianic Jewish Alliance of America Annual Conferences:

Chernoff, Martin. "Jewish Revival." 1982.

Chernoff, David. "Messianic Synagogues." 1982.

Coghill, Rick. "Non-Jews in a Jewish Congregation." 1980.

Finkelstein, Debbie. "Dangers of Assimilation." 1982.
"Jewish Holidays in a Messianic Lifestyle." 1982.

Fischer, Patrice. "Assimilation: How We Confront It." 1979.

Klayman, Elliot. "The Importance of Jewish Identity." 1982b.

Nelson, Norman. "The Biblical Basis for Messianic Judaism." 1982.

Recorded Interviews with the Leader of the Hamilton Friends of Israel:

Nov. 18, 25, 1981; Dec. 2, 10, 16, 1981; Jan. 6, 13, 20, 27, 1982; Feb. 1, 8, 17, 24, 1982; Mar. 1, 3, 10, 1982.

Recorded Interviews and Testimony of Members of the Hamilton Friends of Israel:

Jan. 27, 1982; Feb. 10, 1982; Feb. 18, 1982.

Recorded Interview with the Assistant to the Director of the American Board of Missions to the Jews, Canadian Head Office:

Gloria Walker, January, 1982.

Recorded Interview with the Assistant to the Director of the Toronto office of the Jews for Jesus:

Dec. 6, 1982.

APPENDIX

A Questionnaire of the Hamilton Friends of Israel (HFOI)

Prepared by Rachael Kohn
Dept. of Religious Studies
McMaster University

January, 1984

1. How long have you been attending the HFOI?

   a) Sunday Service? ____ weeks ____ months ____ years
   b) Tuesday meetings? ____ weeks ____ months ____ years
   c) Thursday meetings? ____ weeks ____ months ____ years

2. If you attend the HFOI Sunday service, about how often?

   a) once a month
   b) twice a month
   c) weekly
   d) once in a while

3. If you attend the HFOI Tuesday meeting, about how often?

   a) once a month
   b) twice a month
   c) weekly
   d) once in a while

4. If you attend the HFOI Thursday meeting, about how often?

   a) once a month
   b) twice a month
   c) weekly
   d) once in a while

5. How long does it usually take you to get to the HFOI?

   a) 15 minutes or less
   b) 30 minutes or less
   c) 1 hour or less
   d) over an hour

6. How do you travel there?

   a) by car
   b) by bus
   c) by foot

7. Do you have any extra duties in the HFOI? ___ yes ___ no

   If "yes", do you serve in any of the following capacities?

   a) instructor or leader of Bible study
   b) elder
   c) singer, musician, or dancer
   d) Sunday school teacher
   e) other (please specify)

8. Do you make financial contributions to the HFOI?
   ____ yes ____ no

   If "yes", is that a) regularly or b) once in a while?

9. Are you a member of another congregation? ___ yes ___ no

   If "yes", which of the following type of congregation?

   a) church
   b) fellowship
   c) other (please specify)

10. Please give the denomination or the name of the church or fellowship (or "other"): _____

11. How often do you attend the other church or fellowship?

   a) once a month
   b) about twice a month
   c) about weekly
   d) once in a while

12. Which of the other congregation's services do you attend?

   a) Sunday morning service
   b) weeknight service
   c) Sunday evening service
   d) other (please specify)

13. Were you a member of another church or fellowship when began to attend the HFOI? ____ yes ____ no

   If "yes", did you eventually drop your other membership or affiliation? ____ yes ____ no

14. If you became a member of a church or fellowship after you began to attend the HFOI, what was your reason for doing so?

_____
_____
_____

15. If you are attending both the HFOI and another church or fellowship, do you consider one of these more important to you than the other? ____ yes ____ no

How would you compare them?

a) the other congregation is more important
b) the other congregation is less important
c) the other congregation is equally important

16. Please explain why you feel the other congregation is "more" or "less" or "equally" important as the HFOI is to you.

_____
_____
_____

17. How did you first become acquainted with the HFOI?

_____
_____
_____

18. Why did you first attend the HFOI?

_____
_____
_____

19. What is the one thing that most attracts you to the HFOI?

_____
_____
_____
_____

20. What other things do you appreciate about the HFOI?

_____
_____
_____
_____

21. If there was something you could change about the HFOI, what would it be?

_____
_____
_____
_____

22. Would you say that the HFOI is unique in Hamilton, and that it is not like any other church or fellowship you know of? ____ yes ____ no

Please explain why or why not. _____
_____
_____
_____

23. Have you been to Israel? ____ yes ____ no ____ more than once

Have you been to Israel with the HFOI leader and his wife? ____ yes ____ no

24. Do you expect to travel to Israel?

a) again
b) for the first time

25. Do you presently take Hebrew lessons? ____ yes ____ no

Do you expect to take Hebrew lessons? ____ yes ____ no
____ unsure

Vital Statistics

1. Are you ____ male or ____ female?

2. Are you

a) under 25 years old?
b) between 26 and 35 years old?
c) between 36 and 45 years old?
d) between 46 and 65 years old?
e) over 65 years old?

3. Do you have children? ____ yes ____ no

4. Do your children attend the HFOI with you?
____ yes ____ no

Do your children attend the HFOI Sunday school?
____ yes ____ no

Do your children attend the Sunday school of another church or fellowship? ____ yes ____ no

5. What is (or are) your occupation(s)?

_____
(If relevant, include `pensioner', `housewife', `full-time or part-time student'.)

6. What is your religious background?

a) Protestant
b) Roman Catholic
c) Protestant and Catholic
d) Jewish
e) part-Jewish
f) Other (please specify)

7. Do you have any additional comments you would like to make that have not been addressed by this questionnaire?

_____
_____
_____

THANK YOU